



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021

No. 67

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 19, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DEBBIE DINGELL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

VALUE OF INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, as the son of a civil engineer, I was raised with an understanding of the value of infrastructure that serves people and benefits communities. My commitment to infrastructure has spanned decades. As a young man, I put shovel to the road for the construction of highways and bridges; and now, today, I advocate for infrastructure improvements in Congress.

As we know all too well in rural Pennsylvania, infrastructure has real-life consequences for communities. At its core, improving roads, bridges, and other key infrastructure should be a commonsense, bipartisan priority. Failing infrastructure does not discriminate. A broken bridge can harm Democrats just as it can harm Republicans.

Unfortunately, the so-called infrastructure reform put forth by President Biden fails to take seriously the challenges that we are currently facing in Pennsylvania and around the entire country. In the rural district that I represent, we know the importance of true infrastructure. We need to make our roadways and bridges safer, we need to improve our transportation systems, and we desperately need to deploy reliable internet to those lacking access to broadband. This is what true infrastructure is. But, unfortunately, that is not the Biden plan.

Let's look at the facts. In President Biden's infrastructure plan, less than 6 percent would go to roads and bridges; less than 2 percent would go to waterways, locks, dams, ports, and airports; and less than 5 percent, unfortunately, would go to broadband.

With \$600 billion devoted to the Green New Deal, this has never been about infrastructure. In Pennsylvania, the extreme policies championed in the Biden plan will crush our vital manufacturing and energy industries. This plan prioritizes the progressive agenda over the needs of the American workers and small businesses.

In the name of infrastructure, Democrats want to kill jobs, raise taxes, burden families, and stunt our recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Today, I ask a very simple question: Is it worth it?

As we seek to define infrastructure and consider improvements to our Nation's fundamental infrastructure needs, I urge all of my colleagues to

dispense with the political games. We need roads, bridges, and reliable internet. We do not need the Green New Deal. Stop calling this infrastructure. Stop hiding progressive policies in Trojan horses. Stop trying to trick the American people.

While I stand ready to work with the President and House Democrats on what is true infrastructure reform, this plan is further evidence that the Biden-Harris administration are more happy to push their radical agenda at the expense of hardworking Americans.

Instead of propelling these radical policies, this could be a good-faith opportunity to deliver results for the American people. If we work together, we can get this job done. From deploying rural broadband to sustaining our basic roads, we must bridge this divide.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF STEVEN KOPPERUD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of the great voices for American agriculture here in our Nation's Capital, Steven L. Kopperud.

His death this past year was sudden and a shock to all of us who knew him. Steve was always the same, from the first day I met him almost 25 years ago until the last time we talked. He was a great friend, one whom you could trust to shoot you straight. As are so many in the agriculture arena, he was a down-to-earth, great guy; the type you could pick up a conversation with as though you had just talked yesterday when, in fact, it could have been a year or more; the type who would always be there for you. And if it was a policy question, he always, always, had the facts. He believed in his work, and he was passionate about it.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1893

After growing up in Minneapolis and attending the University of Minnesota, Steve started his career in journalism, writing for the Minneapolis Star Tribune and the San Diego Union-Tribune. He eventually became the Washington bureau chief for Feedstuffs, which further introduced him to the world of agriculture.

From there, he launched a long, distinguished career in advocacy, lobbying on all things animal, everything from food, livestock, poultry, trade, and animal welfare, to biotech, among countless other agricultural issues. He was a founder of the Animal Alliance Association, and eventually started his own firm to represent clients across the Nation's agriculture sector.

Steve played an instrumental role in the passage of every farm bill in the past 35 years, from his first in 1985 to his last in 2018. He could always be found in the Halls of Congress, the White House, or USDA, making the case for commonsense agriculture policies critical to our producers and American consumers. And by the fortuitous nature of events early on in his career, he became a key voice with great expertise in the animal welfare policy arena.

Steve leaves behind his wife, Judith, of more than 45 years, and many, many friends. The contributions he made to agriculture were numerous, leaving a great legacy of advocacy that has benefited American producers and has helped to feed the world. His was a life very well-lived, and American agriculture is that much better because of Steve Kopperud, and so is our country.

TRIBUTE TO CAROLYN JUSTICE

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay particular tribute to an individual who has been an institution in the Cape Fear region for decades, my friend and former colleague in the State legislature, Carolyn Justice.

Carolyn served five terms in the North Carolina House of Representatives, representing New Hanover and Pender Counties. Before her service in the State legislature, she served on Pender County's Board of Commissioners. She has also served as a trustee of New Hanover Regional Medical Center, Pender Memorial Hospital, and as chair of the Lower Cape Fear River Program.

Now, I got to know Carolyn while serving in the State Senate. She was a co-chair of the State House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and Natural and Economic Resources, while I was co-chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. So we got to know each other quite well as we went line by line of the State budget, making cuts to the programs under our purview.

The economic collapse of 2008 and 2009 had left the State budget in shambles, and it was our job to help balance it. These were not easy decisions, but, with Carolyn as a key partner, we made the budget numbers work while doing our best to fund the programs of most value to the citizens of the State.

Through her service and kindness to others, Carolyn Justice continues to leave an indelible mark on southeastern North Carolina. This is why it is so fitting that she was recently named by the Wilmington Star-News in March, which was Women's History Month 2021, as one of 106 women who have made the Port City area a better place.

I don't know of anyone who stands stronger for the Cape Fear region and the causes in which she believes. This is a well-deserved honor for a very distinguished public servant and my great friend and colleague.

CELEBRATING THE NOMINATION OF REAR ADMIRAL MICHAEL BOYLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the service, sacrifice, and recent nomination of one of my constituents, Rear Admiral Michael E. Boyle.

Admiral Boyle has served as director of Maritime Operations for the U.S. Pacific Fleet since June of 2020. Admiral Boyle was designated a naval aviator in January of 1990.

In his 30 years of dedicated service, he has held numerous positions throughout the United States Naval Command. Whether it was operational tours, like aboard the USS *Forrestal* in support of Operation Provide Comfort in Northern Iraq, or aboard the USS *Saratoga* in support of Operation Provide Promise in Bosnia, Admiral Boyle has shown what leadership, fortitude, and duty look like in the United States Navy.

I commend the Secretary of Defense, General Lloyd Austin for his nomination of Rear Admiral Boyle to the rank of two-star flag officer, rear admiral, in the United States Navy. His work in keeping our Nation safe and securing American interests abroad have not gone unnoticed.

I want to personally thank Rear Admiral Michael Boyle for his service to this country and his steadfast duty in defense of our Constitution.

Congratulations, Admiral. Semper Fortis.

HONORING ASSISTANT CHIEF OF POLICE JOHN JOCK

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished service of Assistant Chief of Police John Jock of the Orange Park Police Department.

Over the past 25 years, Assistant Chief Jock has worked under three police chiefs, four town managers, and has become a valued member of the force in our community. Starting as a patrol officer for the OPPD back in 1996, he has earned promotions three times, achieving the rank of assistant police chief, and even receiving his master's degree in the process.

He graduated from the FDLE Florida Leadership Academy in 2011, and served

on the Clay County SWAT team for over a decade. Mr. Jock has been on the front lines of law enforcement for a quarter century and, in that time, has investigated and solved criminal cases, provided disaster training and communication, and has been a valued community leader.

As a citizen of Orange Park for the last 22 years, Assistant Chief Jock entered retirement earlier this month after 25 years of service. As the wife of a fellow SWAT team member, I want to wish him and his family a happy, safe, and productive retirement.

HONORING CAPTAIN MARK ELAM

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life and service of Captain Mark Elam of the Putnam County Department of Corrections.

Captain Elam served in the Putnam County Sheriff's Office for nearly 20 years and, in that time, proved himself to be a hardworking servant.

Before joining the sheriff's office, Mark served 4 years in the United States Marine Corps. But the role that he excelled at the most was as a family man. He was a devoted husband to his wife, Lachrishia, for 15 years and a father to two children. Before Captain Elam's death last week, Mark and his wife were in the process of adopting five siblings.

He had a servant's heart and so much compassion to give. His loss leaves a hole in the Putnam County law enforcement community, but his memory will live on in the work and good deeds he did in life.

I want to extend my condolences to his wife, children, and the entire Putnam County Sheriff's Office in their enormous loss.

God bless Captain Elam and his family.

You've got the watch.

□ 1215

HONORING GILCHRIST COUNTY SHERIFF'S SERGEANT NOEL RAMIREZ AND DEPUTY TAYLOR LINDSEY

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Gilchrist County Sheriff's Sergeant Noel Ramirez and Deputy Taylor Lindsey who were both gunned down in the line of duty 3 years ago today.

On April 19, 2018, Sergeant Ramirez and Deputy Lindsey were eating lunch at a restaurant in Trenton, Florida, when a coward fired through a window and killed both officers in the line of duty. That man—whose name does not deserve to be mentioned—killed those two officers, consumed by a radical hate for law enforcement. That same hate for law enforcement that we saw then I continue to see today.

Now more than ever we need to publicly and boldly support our law enforcement officers.

Noel and Taylor's deaths remind us of the constant vigilance that an officer needs to have in order to return home safely to their families every night. Being an LEO is a difficult and often thankless job.

I want to take a moment to thank Sergeant Ramirez and Deputy Lindsey for their service and sacrifice to our community. We honor their legacy by continuing to say their names and remember their sacrifice and love for our hometown.

I pledge to always have our brothers and sisters in uniform's six.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

God our shepherd, You have entrusted us with the responsibility to tend Your sheep, to feed them and watch over them. May we be worthy of this mantle of awesome responsibility and live wholeheartedly into this task. May nothing we do be done simply out of obligation. But having received Your tender mercies in our own lives, may we be eager to serve You and those whom You have commended to our care.

And if we lose sight of Your claim on our lives and waver in our duties, call us to examine the multitude of instances where You have showered Your grace upon us.

How then can we help but be so transformed that we would want nothing else but to give of ourselves from the depths of our souls?

May we then be examples of what it means to serve You. May we live lives of kindness and humility, not lifting ourselves up, but waiting with patience for the moment when, in the fullness of time, You reveal the purpose for all our efforts and energies, in Your gracious plan.

In the meantime, we cast ourselves—our anxieties, our best intentions, and our most fervent hopes on You—in sure and certain hope of Your steadfast love for us.

It is in the strength of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TITUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DOUBLE STANDARDS

(Mrs. MCCLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Madam Speaker, today I rise because of the double standards in this Chamber. Once again, this weekend we saw a Member of the majority openly call for more confrontation in a Minneapolis suburb. That very night there was a drive-by shooting in that community where police and National Guardsmen were targeted.

If this were reversed, if this were said by a Republican, you know, Madam Speaker, that the majority in this Chamber would move to strip that Representative of their committees and possibly move to expel them from Congress.

We have actually seen this before.

If what President Trump said on January 6 was inciting a riot, then what do the words "get more confrontational" mean?

Are those not the words someone would use if they wanted to incite more violence or insurrection?

If the majority cares about this institution, and if the majority cares about our Nation, then they need to get their own house in order and tamp down this vile rhetoric.

RECOGNIZING LORRIE FORD MERKER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lorrie Ford Merker for all the work she has done to improve the lives of Georgia's blueberry farmers.

Lorrie has made outstanding contributions to the blueberry industry for three decades. Born and raised in southeastern Michigan, Lorrie graduated from Michigan State University and has spent her entire adult life improving the agriculture sector.

For the past 32 years Lorrie has worked with the Michigan Blueberry Growers Association which represents 250 growers in eight States and British

Columbia. She has also been involved in advocacy at the State and national levels to promote an understanding of the labor and environmental challenges facing farmers.

Throughout her career she has accumulated a long list of awards and accomplishments, including the North American Blueberry Council's Alex Wetherbee Award, for her outstanding contributions to the promotion and marketing of blueberries.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Lorrie for all the work she has done for Georgia's blueberry growers and for growers across the country.

HONORING BERNELL TRAMMELL

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of the great Bernell Trammell of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, who owned eXpressions Journal Publications, which was located on 915 East Wright Street.

Bernell Trammell was an avid reader and a very religious man who liked people. He graduated from Lincoln High School in Milwaukee.

Last July 23, he was shot dead carrying a sign for Donald Trump.

I would like to ask the city of Milwaukee to dial up the investigation for the murder of Bernell Trammell. I believe it is a shame in Milwaukee that when someone—one of few people—stands up and announces by a sign that he is voting for Donald Trump that he would be shot dead.

He was an iconoclast, he was a very spiritual man delving in different religions, and he was all over the political spectrum as far as the people he endorsed. But while he was carrying a Donald Trump sign, he was shot down last July 23.

I beg the city of Milwaukee to do something about this horrible crime.

MARIJUANA BANKING BILL

(Mr. GOOD of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1996, the marijuana banking bill. This legislation is about legitimizing and bankrolling the marijuana industry and making legalization inevitable.

It is sad that the House is voting on this bill during a time when our country is seeing increases in addiction, depression, and suicide. Rather than helping victims of despair, we are enhancing the financial benefits for those peddling and profiting off the sale of marijuana.

We are not even directly debating our drug laws. No. We are cowardly debating if we should reward States for undermining the rule of law.

Despite what the swamp says, we don't need recreational marijuana. As

recently as 2016, the DEA determined that marijuana should remain a schedule I substance.

I don't care what the lobbyists or talking heads for the marijuana industry like John Boehner say, I care about keeping dangerous substances away from our children and standing for the values I was elected to fight for.

The last thing our country needs is our help facilitating the profitability of addictive, behavior-altering, recreational drug use.

I oppose the bill, and I urge every Member to do the same.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Friday, April 16, 2021:

S. 164, to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes;

S. 415, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the scope of new chemical exclusivity;

S. 578, to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY MORALE, RECOGNITION, LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT ACT OF 2021

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 490) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 490

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Morale, Recognition, Learning and Engagement Act of 2021" or the "DHS MORALE Act".

SEC. 2. CHIEF HUMAN CAPITAL OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 704 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ", including with respect to leader development and employee engagement," after "policies";

(ii) by striking "and in line" and inserting "in line"; and

(iii) by inserting "and informed by best practices within the Federal government and the private sector," after "priorities,";

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "develop performance measures to provide a basis for monitoring and evaluating" and inserting "use performance measures to evaluate, on an ongoing basis,";

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting "that, to the extent practicable, are informed by employee feedback" after "policies";

(D) in paragraph (4), by inserting "including leader development and employee engagement programs," before "in coordination";

(E) in paragraph (5), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: "that is informed by an assessment, carried out by the Chief Human Capital Officer, of the learning and developmental needs of employees in supervisory and non-supervisory roles across the Department and appropriate workforce planning initiatives";

(F) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively; and

(G) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraphs:

"(9) maintain a catalogue of available employee development opportunities, including the Homeland Security Rotation Program pursuant to section 844, departmental leadership development programs, interagency development programs, and other rotational programs;

"(10) ensure that employee discipline and adverse action programs comply with the requirements of all pertinent laws, rules, regulations, and Federal guidance, and ensure due process for employees;

"(11) analyze each Department or Government-wide Federal workforce satisfaction or morale survey not later than 90 days after the date of the publication of each such survey and submit to the Secretary such analysis, including, as appropriate, recommendations to improve workforce satisfaction or morale within the Department;

"(12) review and approve all component employee engagement action plans to ensure such plans include initiatives responsive to the root cause of employee engagement challenges, as well as outcome-based performance measures and targets to track the progress of such initiatives;"

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) CHIEF LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT OFFICER.—The Chief Human Capital Officer may designate an employee of the Department to serve as a Chief Learning and Engagement Officer to assist the Chief Human Capital Officer in carrying out this section.";

and

(4) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) information on employee development opportunities catalogued pursuant to paragraph (9) of subsection (b) and any available data on participation rates, attrition rates, and impacts on retention and employee satisfaction;

"(3) information on the progress of Department-wide strategic workforce planning efforts as determined under paragraph (2) of subsection (b);

"(4) information on the activities of the steering committee established pursuant to section 711(a), including the number of meetings, types of materials developed and distributed, and recommendations made to the Secretary;"

SEC. 3. EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE AND ACTION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 711. EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT.

"(a) STEERING COMMITTEE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish an employee engagement steering committee, including representatives from operational components, headquarters, and field personnel, including supervisory and non-supervisory personnel, and employee labor organizations that represent Department employees, and chaired by the Under Secretary for Management, to carry out the following activities:

"(1) Identify factors that have a negative impact on employee engagement, morale, and communications within the Department, such as perceptions about limitations on career progression, mobility, or development opportunities, collected through employee feedback platforms, including through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate.

"(2) Identify, develop, and distribute initiatives and best practices to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications within the Department, including through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate.

"(3) Monitor efforts of each component to address employee engagement, morale, and communications based on employee feedback provided through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate.

"(4) Advise the Secretary on efforts to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications within specific components and across the Department.

"(5) Conduct regular meetings and report, not less than once per quarter, to the Under Secretary for Management, the head of each component, and the Secretary on Department-wide efforts to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications.

"(b) ACTION PLAN; REPORTING.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief Human Capital Officer, shall—

“(1) not later than 120 days after the date of the establishment of the employee engagement steering committee under subsection (a), issue a Department-wide employee engagement action plan, reflecting input from the steering committee and employee feedback provided through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications in accordance with paragraph (1) of such subsection, to execute strategies to improve employee engagement, morale, and communications within the Department; and

“(2) require the head of each component to—

“(A) develop and implement a component-specific employee engagement plan to advance the action plan required under paragraph (1) that includes performance measures and objectives, is informed by employee feedback provided through annual employee surveys, questionnaires, and other communications, as appropriate, and sets forth how employees and, where applicable, their labor representatives are to be integrated in developing programs and initiatives;

“(B) monitor progress on implementation of such action plan; and

“(C) provide to the Chief Human Capital Officer and the steering committee quarterly reports on actions planned and progress made under this paragraph.

“(c) **TERMINATION.**—This section shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 710 the following new item:

“Sec. 711. Employee engagement.”.

(c) **SUBMISSIONS TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **DEPARTMENT-WIDE EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ACTION PLAN.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the Department-wide employee engagement action plan required under subsection (b)(1) of section 711 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a) of this section) not later than 30 days after the issuance of such plan under such subsection (b)(1).

(2) **COMPONENT-SPECIFIC EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT PLANS.**—Each head of a component of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate the component-specific employee engagement plan of each such component required under subsection (b)(2) of section 711 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 not later than 30 days after the issuance of each such plan under such subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 4. ANNUAL EMPLOYEE AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 712. ANNUAL EMPLOYEE AWARD PROGRAM.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may establish an annual employee award program to recognize Department employees or groups of employees for significant contributions to the achievement of the Department's goals and missions. If such a program is established, the Secretary shall—

“(1) establish within such program categories of awards, each with specific criteria, that emphasizes honoring employees who are at the non-supervisory level;

“(2) publicize within the Department how any employee or group of employees may be nominated for an award;

“(3) establish an internal review board comprised of representatives from Department components, headquarters, and field personnel to submit to the Secretary award recommendations regarding specific employees or groups of employees;

“(4) select recipients from the pool of nominees submitted by the internal review board under paragraph (3) and convene a ceremony at which employees or groups of employees receive such awards from the Secretary; and

“(5) publicize such program within the Department.

“(b) **INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD.**—The internal review board described in subsection (a)(3) shall, when carrying out its function under such subsection, consult with representatives from operational components and headquarters, including supervisory and non-supervisory personnel, and employee labor organizations that represent Department employees.

“(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize additional funds to carry out the requirements of this section or to require the Secretary to provide monetary bonuses to recipients of an award under this section.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 711 the following new item:

“Sec. 712. Annual employee award program.”.

SEC. 5. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall investigate whether the application in the Department of Homeland Security of discipline and adverse actions are administered in an equitable and consistent manner that results in the same or substantially similar disciplinary outcomes across the Department for misconduct by a non-supervisory or supervisor employee who engaged in the same or substantially similar misconduct.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out the investigation described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security and the employee engagement steering committee established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of section 711 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 3(a) of this Act).

(c) **ACTION BY UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT.**—Upon completion of the investigation described in subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security shall review the findings and recommendations of such investigation and implement a plan, in consultation with the employee engagement steering committee established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of section 711 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to correct any relevant deficiencies identified by the Comptroller General of the United States in such investigation. The Under Secretary for Management shall direct the employee engagement steering committee to review such plan to inform committee activities and action plans authorized under such section 711.

SEC. 6. IMPACTS OF SHUTDOWN.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of

Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate regarding the direct and indirect impacts of the lapse in appropriations between December 22, 2018, and January 25, 2019, on—

(1) Department of Homeland Security human resources operations;

(2) the Department's ability to meet hiring benchmarks; and

(3) retention, attrition, and morale of Department personnel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 490, the DHS MORALE Act.

Every day, the Department of Homeland Security workforce carries out an array of critical missions, from screening travelers to securing cyberspace, to responding to disasters.

The 240,000 men and women who make up this workforce should feel appreciated, not only by the American people, but also by DHS. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case.

The Office of Personnel Management has found that DHS employees are consistently less satisfied with their jobs compared to the average Federal employee. Since 2005, DHS' own employees ranked the Department dead last among large Federal departments in the annual Best Places to Work in the Federal Government survey. Scratching below the surface, the Best Places to Work in the Federal Government survey found that DHS' workforce is the most dissatisfied when it comes to training, teamwork, work-life balance, and support for diversity.

In response to the concerns expressed by the workforce, Chairman THOMPSON introduced the DHS MORALE Act to require DHS to create and implement policies related to leadership development, employee engagement, career progression, and employee recognition.

Specifically, H.R. 490 requires the Department to prioritize career development opportunities and leadership development opportunities for DHS employees.

Additionally, it would require DHS to establish an employee engagement steering committee comprised of employees across the Department to better identify the causes of low morale

and what initiatives are working to improve it, and to establish an annual employee award program to recognize those in the DHS workforce who go above and beyond in their work to protect the homeland.

Identical versions of this measure have been approved by the House in prior Congresses.

This Congress, a new provision was added to the bill to respond to recommendations issued last month by the Government Accountability Office regarding morale challenges at the Department.

The provision directs DHS' chief human capital officer to review and approve DHS component agency plans to ensure they include initiatives to address the root causes of low morale and performance metrics for measuring implementation of those initiatives.

Enactment of H.R. 490 will help put DHS on a path toward fixing the longstanding morale problems at DHS.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 490, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 490, the Department of Homeland Security MORALE Act of 2021.

This legislation, sponsored by Chairman THOMPSON, will empower the Department's chief human capital officer to improve leadership development, employee engagement, and morale at the Department, which consistently ranks near the bottom of all Federal departments.

This bill will support the Department's most important asset, the many dedicated security professionals that work diligently to better protect our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 490, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 490 will improve morale among the Department's 240,000 employees. That is why it has the support of unions representing DHS employees: The National Border Patrol Council, the National Treasury Employees Union, and the American Federation of Government Employees.

Enactment of H.R. 490 will also force DHS to examine the root causes of the longstanding morale problems and develop responsive approaches to move the Department forward in a positive direction.

Madam Speaker, I ask for my colleagues' support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 490, "DHS MORALE Act," which expands the duties of the Chief Human Capital Officer to address morale throughout the Department of Homeland Security.

The bill provides for:

1. leader development and employee engagement,
2. maintaining a catalogue of available employee development opportunities, and
3. issuing a DHS-wide employee engagement action plan.

The bill directs DHS to establish an employee engagement steering committee and authorizes it to establish an annual employee award program.

DHS is also required to report to the congressional homeland security committees the impacts of the lapse in appropriations between December 22, 2018 and January 25, 2019 on (1) DHS human resources operations; (2) DHS's ability to meet hiring benchmarks; and (3) retention, attrition, and morale of DHS personnel.

As a senior member of this committee I have long been troubled by the low morale, employee retention and job opportunities within the entire agency and what impact these issues have had on homeland security.

Over my service on this committee, from its inception, I have learned a great deal about the capacity and strength of the men and women who work at the Department of Homeland Security.

I hold them in the highest regard for their dedication and service to our country.

This nation depends on the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to protect citizens from those who wish to do them harm.

DHS is charged with protecting the nation from terrorism threats.

The agency also assists local, state, and federal law enforcement to prepare to meet those threats which are significantly different than what was seen on September 11, 2001.

Because of the dedication of DHS professionals, we are better prepared to face these challenges as one nation united against a common foe.

The Department of Homeland Security was not created to protect the nation from desperate people escaping violence and poverty, seeking asylum in our country or the ravages of a virus attacking and killing over half a million Americans.

It was created to prevent attacks against our nation such as the one carried out by foreign terrorists who used commercial planes as missiles to destroy the World Trade Center Towers, and a section of the west side of the Pentagon, and would have killed more if not for the heroic acts of the passengers on Flight 93 to stop the attackers from reaching their ultimate destination right here at our nation's Capitol.

On January 6, 2021, our nation was once again threatened, but it was from an enemy found on our own shores led by the former President of the United States to attack the Capitol building during the constitutionally mandated Joint Meeting of Congress to count the ballots cast by presidential electors and announce the results and the winner to the nation and the world.

Today, our nation faces multiple crisis at the same time that are challenging our way of life, values, and resolve; challenges the American

people are, and will be, prepared to face and overcome.

As Americans we are best when we are true to the values we hold dear, beginning with fidelity to the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

The Department of Homeland Security has had low employee morale and low employee engagement since it began operations in 2003 and this must change.

In 2019, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report on DHS employee morale.

This report addressed:

1. drivers of employee engagement at DHS and
2. the extent that DHS has initiatives to improve employee engagement and ensures effective engagement action planning.

GAO analyzed employee trends within DHS, reviewed component employee engagement action plans and met with officials from DHS and component human capital offices as well as unions and employee groups.

I was at the Capitol on September 11, 2001, and I will never forget the Members who were there with me as we sang God Bless America on the steps of the Capitol.

In the days and weeks following the attacks, we were uncertain what threat might come and how many lives might be lost as we worked to put resources in place to deal with an enemy that might be among us.

Over the past nineteen years we have learned a great deal about homeland security, but we must learn more about making sure that agency professionals have what they need to excel.

We will be better prepared to face these challenges as one nation, united against a common foe, when morale issues within DHS have been effectively addressed.

I urge all members to join me in voting for H.R. 490, DHS MORALE Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 490.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

TRUSTED TRAVELER RECONSIDERATION AND RESTORATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 473) to require a review of Department of Homeland Security trusted traveler programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 473

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Trusted Traveler Reconsideration and Restoration Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of Department of Homeland Security trusted traveler programs. Such review shall examine the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Homeland Security tracks data and monitors trends related to trusted traveler programs, including root causes for identity-matching errors resulting in an individual's enrollment in a trusted traveler program being reinstated.

(2) Whether the Department coordinates with the heads of other relevant Federal, State, local, Tribal, or territorial entities regarding redress procedures for disqualifying offenses not covered by the Department's own redress processes but which offenses impact an individual's enrollment in a trusted traveler program.

(3) How the Department may improve individuals' access to reconsideration procedures regarding a disqualifying offense for enrollment in a trusted traveler program that requires the involvement of any other Federal, State, local, Tribal, or territorial entity.

(4) The extent to which travelers are informed about reconsideration procedures regarding enrollment in a trusted traveler program.

SEC. 3. ENROLLMENT REDRESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, with respect to an individual whose enrollment in a trusted traveler program was revoked in error extend by an amount of time equal to the period of revocation the period of active enrollment in such a program upon re-enrollment in such a program by such an individual.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 473, the Trusted Traveler Reconsideration and Restoration Act of 2021.

Before the pandemic, millions of travelers participated in DHS' trusted traveler programs, like TSA's PreCheck and CBP's Global Entry, NEXUS, SENTRI, and FAST programs, to get them where they need to go a little faster.

These are win-win programs where DHS moves vetted goods and people in an expeditious manner, thereby freeing

up screening resources to focus on higher-risk travelers.

Given the benefits of these programs, it is troubling to hear about people being unable to enroll in one of these programs, despite meeting all of the security requirements needed to participate.

We all have an interest in ensuring that the vetting for these programs is thorough and, where there are identifying matching errors or other issues that may result in a qualified applicant being wrongly rejected, the issues get addressed in a timely way.

To ensure these programs are operating effectively and consistently, H.R. 473 directs the Government Accountability Office to review DHS' trusted traveler programs. The GAO's study will provide important insight into the Department's identity matching process and the redress options available to those who are improperly rejected.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 473, the Trusted Traveler Reconsideration and Restoration Act of 2021.

This bill, sponsored by Ranking Member JOHN KATKO and cosponsored by Chairwomen WATSON COLEMAN and SLOTKIN, seeks to ensure the rights of travelers who have erroneously had their trusted traveler status revoked.

From the CBP's Global Entry and NEXUS to TSA's PreCheck programs, the Department of Homeland Security's trusted traveler programs are critical to the safe and secure free movement of people. However, there are instances in which individuals are mistaken for people with the same or similar name or who otherwise find themselves in a position where they lose their trusted traveler status based on a database error.

For those unfortunate persons, the process of getting their trusted traveler status reinstated by DHS involves timely, cumbersome, and confusing bureaucratic hurdles, often among several Federal agencies. In these instances, travelers lose valuable time off of their trusted traveler enrollment period, even though they spent hard-earned money to apply.

H.R. 473 seeks to bring relief to the traveling public who are in need of having their trusted traveler status reinstated. The bill requires a comprehensive review by the Government Accountability Office on the existing DHS processes related to trusted traveler programs and how the Department can improve individuals' access to having their trusted traveler status reinstated when it has been revoked in error.

Additionally, H.R. 473 directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to extend an individual's enrollment in a trusted traveler program by a period commensurate with the amount of

time they lost in their enrollment due to an error.

I thank Ranking Member KATKO for his leadership on this bipartisan bill, and I thank Chairman THOMPSON for his commitment to bringing it to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security's trusted traveler programs are important tools in the Department's toolbox to screen people efficiently and concentrate its resources on high-risk travelers.

It is critical that the Department's processes to vet enrollees be fair, consistent, and based on accurate information. The GAO assessment directed by this bill will help drive DHS to work towards those ends.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. KATKO) for introducing this bill. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 473, the “Trusted Traveler Reconsideration and Restoration Act of 2021,” which directs the Government Accountability Office to review Department of Homeland Security (DHS) trusted traveler programs, and DHS to extend the enrollment period where an individual's participation in a trusted traveler program was revoked in error.

The Trusted Traveler consists of several programs that include: Global Entry, TSA Pre✓, SENTRI, NEXUS, and FAST.

The Trusted Traveler Programs are risk-based programs to facilitate the entry of pre-approved travelers.

All applicants are vetted to ensure that they meet the qualifications for the program to which they are applying.

Receiving a “Best Match” or program recommendation based on eligibility or travel habits does not guarantee acceptance into any Trusted Traveler program.

We will be better prepared to face these challenges as one nation united against a common foe, when morale issues within DHS have been effectively addressed.

I urge all members to join me in voting for H.R. 473 the “Trusted Traveler Reconsideration and Restoration Act of 2021.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 473.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2021

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 370) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 707 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 347) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) representatives from appropriate advisory committees established pursuant to section 871, including the Homeland Security Advisory Council and the Homeland Security Science and Technology Advisory Committee, or otherwise established, including the Aviation Security Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 44946 of title 49, United States Code; and”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “based on the risk assessment required pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting “, to the extent practicable,” after “describe”; and

(ii) by striking “budget plan” and inserting “resources required”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “, to the extent practicable,” after “identify”;

(ii) by striking “budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully” and inserting “resources required to”; and

(iii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: “, including any resources identified from redundant, wasteful, or unnecessary capabilities or capacities that may be redirected to better support other existing capabilities or capacities, as the case may be; and”;

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(E) by striking paragraph (6);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “December 31 of the year” and inserting “60 days after the date of the submission of the President’s budget for the fiscal year after the fiscal year”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “description of the threats to” and inserting “risk assessment of”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “, as required under subsection (b)(2)” before the semicolon at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting “to the extent practicable,” before “a description”; and

(II) by striking “budget plan” and inserting “resources required”;

(iv) in subparagraph (F)—

(I) by inserting “to the extent practicable,” before “a discussion”; and

(II) by striking “the status of”;

(v) in subparagraph (G)—

(I) by inserting “to the extent practicable,” before “a discussion”;

(II) by striking “the status of”;

(III) by inserting “and risks” before “to national homeland”; and

(IV) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(vi) by striking subparagraph (H); and

(vii) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (H);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary shall retain and, upon request, provide to Congress the following documentation regarding each quadrennial homeland security review:

“(A) Records regarding the consultation carried out pursuant to subsection (a)(3), including the following:

“(i) All written communications, including communications sent out by the Secretary and feedback submitted to the Secretary through technology, online communications tools, in-person discussions, and the inter-agency process.

“(ii) Information on how feedback received by the Secretary informed each such quadrennial homeland security review.

“(B) Information regarding the risk assessment required pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B), including the following:

“(i) The risk model utilized to generate such risk assessment.

“(ii) Information, including data used in the risk model, utilized to generate such risk assessment.

“(iii) Sources of information, including other risk assessments, utilized to generate such risk assessment.

“(iv) Information on assumptions, weighing factors, and subjective judgments utilized to generate such risk assessment, together with information on the rationale or basis thereof.”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) REVIEW.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of each report required under subsection (c)(1), the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on the degree to which the findings and recommendations developed in the quadrennial homeland security review that is the subject of such report were integrated into the acquisition strategy and expenditure plans for the Department.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to a quadrennial homeland security review conducted after December 31, 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 370, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act.

Since 2007, the Department of Homeland Security has been required to produce a quadrennial review of the sprawling Federal department to help chart its course for the future. To date, DHS has issued two Quadrennial Homeland Security Reviews, or QHSRs. The third review, which was due by December 31, 2017, was never released by the Trump administration.

Congress mandated that DHS, like the Defense Department, undertake a bottom-up review every 4 years in recognition of the fact that it has a vital, complex, and ever-expanding set of missions that need to be assessed in regular intervals to help DHS stay ahead of the constantly evolving threats facing our country.

With the deadline for the fourth QHSR fast approaching, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. Watson Coleman) reintroduced this bill to ensure that deficiencies that the Government Accountability Office identified in prior reviews are fully addressed.

In 2016, GAO issued a report that identified several weaknesses in how the Department developed the first two QHSRs. GAO, for example, expressed concerns about the degree to which the Department retained documentation to explain its findings and emphasized that documentation of the review process is essential to ensuring the repeatability of the review process.

□ 1445

Importantly, H.R. 370 requires that DHS retain and, when requested, provide to Congress certain documentation related to each QHSR.

It also addresses weaknesses that GAO identified with respect to consultation with Homeland Security stakeholders and directs robust consultation with State and local governments, academic institutions, and other stakeholders.

Finally, H.R. 370 requires DHS to undertake and document a risk analysis to inform its policy positions, a critical feature that was lacking in prior reviews.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 370, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 370, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act. This legislation makes important improvements to the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review.

This bill has strong bipartisan support from the committee.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, DHS is a sprawling \$50 billion Federal agency with a diverse array of mission sets. As such, it is critical that, every 4 years, DHS carry out a rigorous bottom-up, risk-informed review of the entire department that reflects robust engagement with Homeland Security partners to produce a QHSR that can drive the department's strategic vision for years to come.

Enactment of H.R. 370 will help ensure that happens and that, in the years ahead, DHS better aligns its budgets and programs with its ever-expanding missions.

An identical version of this measure passed the House last Congress by a vote of 415-0.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 370 and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 370.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

HOMELAND SECURITY ACQUISITION PROFESSIONAL CAREER PROGRAM ACT

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 367) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an acquisition professional career program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 367

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Homeland Security Acquisition Professional Career Program Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF THE ACQUISITION PROFESSIONAL CAREER PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 711. ACQUISITION PROFESSIONAL CAREER PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department an acquisition professional career program to develop a cadre of acquisition professionals within the Department.

"(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Under Secretary for Management shall administer the

acquisition professional career program established pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Under Secretary for Management shall carry out the following with respect to the acquisition professional career program.

"(1) Designate the occupational series, grades, and number of acquisition positions throughout the Department to be included in the program and manage centrally such positions.

"(2) Establish and publish on the Department's website eligibility criteria for candidates to participate in the program.

"(3) Carry out recruitment efforts to attract candidates—

"(A) from institutions of higher education, including such institutions with established acquisition specialties and courses of study, historically Black colleges and universities, and Hispanic-serving institutions;

"(B) with diverse work experience outside of the Federal Government; or

"(C) with military service.

"(4) Hire eligible candidates for designated positions under the program.

"(5) Develop a structured program comprised of acquisition training, on-the-job experience, Department-wide rotations, mentorship, shadowing, and other career development opportunities for program participants.

"(6) Provide, beyond required training established for program participants, additional specialized acquisition training, including small business contracting and innovative acquisition techniques training.

"(d) REPORTS.—Not later than December 31, 2021, and annually thereafter through 2027, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the acquisition professional career program. Each such report shall include the following information:

"(1) The number of candidates approved for the program.

"(2) The number of candidates who commenced participation in the program, including generalized information on such candidates' backgrounds with respect to education and prior work experience, but not including personally identifiable information.

"(3) A breakdown of the number of participants hired under the program by type of acquisition position.

"(4) A list of Department components and offices that participated in the program and information regarding length of time of each program participant in each rotation at such components or offices.

"(5) Program attrition rates and post-program graduation retention data, including information on how such data compare to the prior year's data, as available.

"(6) The Department's recruiting efforts for the program.

"(7) The Department's efforts to promote retention of program participants.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Hispanic-serving institution' has the meaning given such term in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a).

"(2) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—The term 'historically Black colleges and universities' has the meaning given the term 'part B institution' in section 322(2) of Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).

"(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 710 the following new item:

"Sec. 711. Acquisition professional career program."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 367, the Homeland Security Acquisition Professional Career Program Act.

H.R. 367 authorizes the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Professional Career Program which, since 2008, has been credited with helping DHS onboard over 300 new hires into its acquisition workforce.

At DHS, acquisition professionals, such as contract specialists, are responsible for spending billions of dollars each year on the goods and services needed for the department to carry out its missions. They acquire everything from disaster relief supplies for FEMA to Coast Guard cutters and software designed to protect Federal Government networks from cyber threats.

Unfortunately, when it comes to hiring and retaining acquisitions professionals, DHS has experienced chronic staffing shortages that, in the view of the Government Accountability Office, create a persistent challenge for DHS that can negatively affect the ability of DHS to acquire vital capabilities on time and on budget.

H.R. 367 seeks to address this challenge by codifying DHS' rigorous development program in which participants are provided with acquisition training, mentorship, department-wide rotations, and other career development opportunities.

Enactment of this measure will help DHS maintain a pipeline for its acquisition workforce to directly support the department's frontline officers and provide them with the tools that they need.

A prior version of this bill passed the House by a voice vote last September on a bipartisan basis.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to once again support this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 367, the Homeland Security Acquisition Professional Career Program Act. This legislation will help create a pipeline for the Department of Homeland Security to better recruit talented acquisition professionals.

This critical program is an important step to making DHS more agile and efficient in its role of protecting our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 367.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Nevada for her leadership on this bill.

Americans look to DHS to respond after a disaster, prevent terrorism, and protect cyberspace. Within DHS, its leaders at every level of the organization look to the acquisition workforce to ensure that the department has the tools needed to get the job done.

Since 2008, DHS' Acquisition Professional Career Program has created a vital pipeline for the department to hire acquisitions professionals who develop their knowledge and skills in house at DHS.

Enactment of H.R. 367 would ensure that DHS is able to continue to run this successful program which the department has come to rely on to help address chronic staffing shortages within its acquisition workforce.

Again, I want to thank and commend the gentlewoman, Congresswoman TITUS from Nevada, who is presently presiding over the House, for her leadership on H.R. 367.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 367. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 367, the "Homeland Security Acquisition Professional Career Program Act," which establishes in the Department of Homeland Security an acquisition professional career program to develop a cadre of acquisition professionals.

Acquisition professionals work in one of six career fields, each of which plays a vital role in Department Acquisition.

The six Acquisition career fields include:

1. Contract Specialist,
2. Program Manager,
3. Logistician,
4. Systems Engineer,
5. Industrial Engineer/Cost Estimator, and
6. IT Acquisition Specialist.

Homeland Security Acquisition Professional Career Program participants are appointed to rotational assignments within department components to gain experience in a wide variety of work environments.

The program is three years, and upon successful completion participants are placed into a permanent full-time position at the GS-12 grade.

Job applications to the Department of Homeland Security go through multiple levels of review.

Human Resources Specialists screen applications to determine whether basic eligibility requirements are met for the position and rate

applications according to the additional qualifications listed in the job announcement.

If the application rates among the best qualified, it will be forwarded to the hiring manager who will make the final selection.

Selection procedures are subject to Federal Civil Service laws, which ensures that all applicants receive fair and equal treatment in the hiring process.

Acquisition Professionals are responsible for nearly \$20 billion in annual purchases for the Department of Homeland Security.

The Management Directorate shall administer this essential program, including carrying out recruitment efforts and providing specialized acquisition training.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for passage of H.R. 367.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 367.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM ACT OF 2021

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 408) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a mentor-protégé program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 408

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Mentor-Protégé Program Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 890B. MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department a mentor-protégé program (in this section referred to as the 'Program') under which a mentor firm enters into an agreement with a protégé firm for the purpose of assisting the protégé firm to compete for prime contracts and subcontracts of the Department.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for mentor firms and protégé firms to be eligible to participate in the Program, including a requirement that a firm is not included on any list maintained by the Federal Government of contractors that have been suspended or debarred.

"(c) PROGRAM APPLICATION AND APPROVAL.—

"(1) APPLICATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization of the Department, shall establish a process for submission of an application jointly by a mentor firm and the protégé firm selected by the mentor firm. The application shall include each of the following:

"(A) A description of the assistance to be provided by the mentor firm, including, to the extent available, the number and a brief description of each anticipated subcontract to be awarded to the protégé firm.

"(B) A schedule with milestones for achieving the assistance to be provided over the period of participation in the Program.

"(C) An estimate of the costs to be incurred by the mentor firm for providing assistance under the Program.

"(D) Attestations that Program participants will submit to the Secretary reports at times specified by the Secretary to assist the Secretary in evaluating the protégé firm's developmental progress.

"(E) Attestations that Program participants will inform the Secretary in the event of a change in eligibility or voluntary withdrawal from the Program.

"(2) APPROVAL.—Not later than 60 days after receipt of an application pursuant to paragraph (1), the head of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization shall notify applicants of approval or, in the case of disapproval, the process for resubmitting an application for reconsideration.

"(3) RESCISSION.—The head of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization may rescind the approval of an application under this subsection if it determines that such action is in the best interest of the Department.

"(d) PROGRAM DURATION.—A mentor firm and protégé firm approved under subsection (c) shall enter into an agreement to participate in the Program for a period of not less than 36 months.

"(e) PROGRAM BENEFITS.—A mentor firm and protégé firm that enter into an agreement under subsection (d) may receive the following Program benefits:

"(1) With respect to an award of a contract that requires a subcontracting plan, a mentor firm may receive evaluation credit for participating in the Program.

"(2) With respect to an award of a contract that requires a subcontracting plan, a mentor firm may receive credit for a protégé firm performing as a first tier subcontractor or a subcontractor at any tier in an amount equal to the total dollar value of any subcontracts awarded to such protégé firm.

"(3) A protégé firm may receive technical, managerial, financial, or any other mutually agreed upon benefit from a mentor firm, including a subcontract award.

"(f) REPORTING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the head of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report that—

"(1) identifies each agreement between a mentor firm and a protégé firm entered into under this section, including the number of protégé firm participants that are—

"(A) small business concerns;

"(B) small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans;

"(C) small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans;

"(D) qualified HUBZone small business concerns;

“(E) small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals;

“(F) small business concerns owned and controlled by women;

“(G) historically Black colleges and universities; and

“(H) minority institutions of higher education;

“(2) describes the type of assistance provided by mentor firms to protégé firms;

“(3) identifies contracts within the Department in which a mentor firm serving as the prime contractor provided subcontracts to a protégé firm under the Program; and

“(4) assesses the degree to which there has been—

“(A) an increase in the technical capabilities of protégé firms; and

“(B) an increase in the quantity and estimated value of prime contract and subcontract awards to protégé firms for the period covered by the report.

“(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit, diminish, impair, or otherwise affect the authority of the Department to participate in any program carried out by or requiring approval of the Small Business Administration or adopt or follow any regulation or policy that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may promulgate, except that, to the extent that any provision of this section (including subsection (h)) conflicts with any other provision of law, regulation, or policy, this section shall control.

“(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.**—The term ‘historically Black college or university’ means any of the historically Black colleges and universities referred to in section 2323 of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on March 1, 2018.

“(2) **MENTOR FIRM.**—The term ‘mentor firm’ means a for-profit business concern that is not a small business concern that—

“(A) has the ability to assist and commits to assisting a protégé to compete for Federal prime contracts and subcontracts; and

“(B) satisfies any other requirements imposed by the Secretary.

“(3) **MINORITY INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term ‘minority institution of higher education’ means an institution of higher education with a student body that reflects the composition specified in section 312(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(b)).

“(4) **PROTÉGÉ FIRM.**—The term ‘protégé firm’ means a small business concern, a historically Black college or university, or a minority institution of higher education that—

“(A) is eligible to enter into a prime contract or subcontract with the Department; and

“(B) satisfies any other requirements imposed by the Secretary.

“(5) **SMALL BUSINESS ACT DEFINITIONS.**—The terms ‘small business concern’, ‘small business concern owned and controlled by veterans’, ‘small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans’, ‘qualified HUBZone small business concern’, ‘and small business concern owned and controlled by women’ have the meanings given such terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632). The term ‘small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals’ has the meaning given such term in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting

after the item relating to section 890A the following new item:

“Sec. 890B. Mentor-protégé program.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 408, the Department of Homeland Security Mentor-Protégé Program Act of 2021.

Since the earliest days of the Department of Homeland Security, it has operated a mentor-protégé program to encourage large businesses to help small businesses build their capacity to compete for government contracts.

However, this important program was never codified in law. H.R. 408 not only authorizes the existing program but improves it.

Small businesses, including woman-, veteran-, and minority-owned firms, are the backbone of our economy, but far too often complex Federal contracting requirements shut them out of the Federal marketplace.

Building and sustaining a reliable pool of small business vendors is critical to ensuring that DHS’ ever-evolving contracting needs are met and America’s security is enhanced.

H.R. 408 seeks to build and sustain this pool by incentivizing large businesses to provide technical, managerial, and financial assistance and subcontracting opportunities to small businesses.

The bill requires participating businesses to commit to a mentor-protégé relationship for 3 years to help establish long-term relationships between large and small contractors.

Additionally, to ensure that Congress can monitor the effectiveness of the program in an ongoing way, it requires DHS to annually report on program participation and the benefits conferred upon small businesses.

Enactment of H.R. 408 will ensure the continued and lasting success of the mentor-protégé program, a vital small business development program.

It should also be noted that this bill passed the House unanimously during the 116th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to once again support this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 408, the Department of Homeland Security Mentor-Protégé Program Act of 2021. This legislation will help the department better improve its contracting with small and disadvantaged firms. In doing so, the department will become stronger and more diverse.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 408. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, formally authorizing the Department of Homeland Security’s mentor-protégé program will ensure the continued success of this important small business program.

John Crosby, the famous conductor, once said, “A mentor is a brain to pick, an ear to listen, and a push in the right direction.”

DHS is to be commended for recognizing that there are small businesses with novel technologies that want to help keep America secure, but may lack experience in the Federal marketplace and need a mentor to give them a push in the right direction.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) for introducing this bill to help grow partnerships between small businesses and DHS.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 408. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 408, the “Department of Homeland Security Mentor-Protégé Program Act of 2021,” which provides statutory authority for the mentor-protégé program of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) under which a mentor firm enters into an agreement with a protégé firm to assist the latter to compete for prime contracts and subcontracts of DHS.

The Mentor-Protégé program is designed to motivate and encourage large business prime contractor firms to provide mutually beneficial developmental assistance to small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns.

The participating Mentor-Protégé Companies, program is also designed to:

1. Improve the performance of contracts and subcontracts.

2. Foster the establishment of long-term business relationships between large prime contractors and small business subcontractors.

3. Strengthen subcontracting opportunities and accomplishments through three incentives.

ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION

All firms must be in good standing in the federal marketplace.

The program excludes firms that are on the Federal List of Debarred or Suspended Contractors.

A Mentor Firm is open to any large business firm that demonstrates the commitment and capability to assist in the development of small business protégés.

A Protégé Firm can partner with all small businesses that meet the definition of small business concern at FAR 19.001, based on their primary NAICS code, are eligible to be protégé firms.

This includes small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns.

Benefits for Mentors to participate in this program include for acquisitions that require for a subcontracting plan, mentors are eligible to receive credit in the source selection/evaluation criteria process for mentor-protégé participation.

Additionally, a post-award incentive for subcontracting plan credit is available by recognizing costs incurred by a mentor firm in providing assistance to a protégé firm and using this credit for purposes of determining whether the mentor firm attains a subcontracting plan participation goal applicable to the mentor firm under a Homeland Security contract.

The program benefits the Protégé by allowing them to receive technical, managerial, financial, or any other mutually agreed upon benefit from mentors including work that flows from a government or commercial contract through subcontracting or teaming arrangements. The assistance could result in significant small business development.

The benefits to the Department of Homeland Security is the opportunity to move from the traditional large business prime contractor/small business subcontractor model to a mentor-protégé relationship model based on mutual agreement, trust, and meaningful business development.

Additionally, mentor-protégé arrangements may provide the Department of Homeland Security with greater assurance that a protégé subcontractor will be able to perform under a contract than a similarly situated non-protégé subcontractor.

Further, protégé firms gain opportunities to seek and perform government and commercial contracts through the guidance and support of mentor firms that may not have been available to them without the mentor-protégé program.

This type of program is working in the Department of Defense with great success. It is time to formalize the work of the mentor-protégé program with DHS.

I ask that my colleagues join me in voting for H.R. 408.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 408.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

and pass the bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 210G the following new section:

“SEC. 210H. CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

“(1) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear materials against the United States, including critical infrastructure;

“(2) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues;

“(3) support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of the homeland security hazards described in paragraphs (1) and (2), including the transportation of chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological materials, by providing relevant quantitative and nonquantitative threat information;

“(4) leverage existing and emerging homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance early detection, prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack;

“(5) share information and provide tailored analytical support on such threats to State, local, Tribal, and territorial authorities, and other Federal agencies, as well as relevant national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders, as appropriate; and

“(6) perform other responsibilities, as assigned by the Secretary.

“(b) COORDINATION.—Where appropriate, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis shall coordinate with other relevant Department components, including the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office and the National Biosurveillance Integration Center, agencies within the intelligence community, including the National Counter Proliferation Center, and other Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial authorities, including officials from high-threat urban areas, State and major urban area fusion centers, and local public health departments, as appropriate, and enable such entities to provide recommendations on optimal information sharing mechanisms, including expeditious sharing of classified information, and on how

such entities can provide information to the Department.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given such term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

“(2) NATIONAL BIOSECURITY AND BIODEFENSE STAKEHOLDERS.—The term ‘national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders’ means officials from Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial authorities and individuals from the private sector who are involved in efforts to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from a biological attack or other phenomena that may have serious health consequences for the United States, including infectious disease outbreaks.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 201E the following new item:

“Sec. 210H. Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing.”.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for each of the following four years, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on the following:

(A) The intelligence and information sharing activities under section 210H of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a) of this section) and of all relevant entities within the Department of Homeland Security to counter the threat from attacks using chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear materials.

(B) The Department’s activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The reports required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the progress of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security in implementing such section 210F.

(B) A description of the methods established to carry out such assessment.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate having legislative jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or Senate, respectively, over the matter concerned.

SEC. 3. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ANALYZED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO STATE, LOCAL, TRIBAL, TERRITORIAL, AND PRIVATE ENTITIES WITH RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO HOMELAND SECURITY.

Paragraph (6) of section 201(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121(d)) is amended by striking “and to agencies of State” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “to State, local, tribal, territorial, and private entities with such responsibilities, and, as appropriate, to the public, in order to assist in preventing, deterring, or responding to acts of terrorism against the United States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

CBRN INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2021

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES)?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 397, the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2021.

This past year, we have witnessed a global pandemic dominate nearly every aspect of American life and claim the lives of over half a million people. As it tore through our communities, it also brought into stark focus hard truths about inequities in our healthcare system, the reliability of our PPE pipeline, the need for better information sharing between the Federal Government and State, local, and private-sector partners.

The legislation before us seeks to promote timely sharing of intelligence about chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats, or CBRN threats. It does so by specifically directing the Department of Homeland Security to analyze CBRN-related terrorist threats and share threat information with Federal, State, and local partners.

In the event of an attack of this nature, situational awareness at all levels of government is key. Better situational awareness is also important to help New York City and other DHS grant recipients more efficiently target their grant dollars to address threats.

Earlier versions of this bill overwhelmingly passed in the House in the last three Congresses, and I urge my colleagues to support the measure once again.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 397, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2021.

We all know that terrorist groups have long sought to develop the capability to attack our Nation with chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials. H.R. 397 would address this threat by requiring the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, within the Department of Homeland Security, to support the homeland security-focused analysis of terrorist capabilities related to chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials, as well as threats to the homeland from global infectious diseases.

To improve coordination with local law enforcement, H.R. 397 requires the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to

share threat information not only with Federal entities but also State, local, Tribal, and territorial agencies.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ), for introducing this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, effective prevention and response to terrorism and naturally occurring threats start with information-sharing.

At a time when threats are changing at such a rapid pace, H.R. 397 will help to facilitate information-sharing to better safeguard the homeland from bad actors.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 397, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 397, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 396) to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to clarify certain allowable uses of funds for public transportation security assistance grants and establish periods of performance for such grants, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 396

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Transit Security Grant Program Flexibility Act”.

SEC. 2. ALLOWABLE USES OF FUNDS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

Subparagraph (A) of section 1406(b)(2) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135(b)(2); Public Law 110-53) is amended by inserting “and associated backfill” after “security training”.

SEC. 3. PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

Section 1406 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135; Public Law 110-53) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (1) the following new subsection:

“(m) PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds provided pursuant to a grant awarded under this section for a use specified in subsection (b) shall remain available for use by a grant recipient for a period of not fewer than 36 months.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Funds provided pursuant to a grant awarded under this section for a use specified in subparagraph (M) or (N) of subsection (b)(1) shall remain available for use by a grant recipient for a period of not fewer than 55 months.”.

SEC. 4. GAO REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the public transportation security assistance grant program under section 1406 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135; Public Law 110-53).

(b) SCOPE.—The review required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the type of projects funded under the public transportation security grant program referred to in such paragraph.

(2) An assessment of the manner in which such projects address threats to public transportation infrastructure.

(3) An assessment of the impact, if any, of this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) on types of projects funded under the public transportation security assistance grant program.

(4) An assessment of the management and administration of public transportation security assistance grant program funds by grantees.

(5) Recommendations to improve the manner in which public transportation security assistance grant program funds address vulnerabilities in public transportation infrastructure.

(6) Recommendations to improve the management and administration of the public transportation security assistance grant program.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and again not later than five years after such date of enactment, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the review required under this section.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 396, the Transit Security Grant Program Flexibility Act.

This legislation, as introduced by my colleague from New York (Mr. GARBARINO), seeks to make common-sense adjustments to a DHS grant program that helps keep my constituents safe.

H.R. 396 requires technical changes to the Transit Security Grant Program to allow grant funding to be used for backfill staffing when associated with security training and give transit authorities more time to expend grant funds on security improvements for public transportation systems or infrastructure.

Our transit systems are absolutely vital to daily travel and commerce. According to U.S. Census figures, 56 percent of all New Yorkers rely on public transportation. In New York City, over 5 million people depend on our trains and subways on a normal workday.

Under the TSGP, New York City's Metropolitan Transit Authority received about \$20 million in fiscal year 2020 to protect riders from acts of terrorism and other targeted violence.

H.R. 396 is informed by feedback from grantees about challenges with the program over the years, and it is intended to ensure that the Transit Security Grant Program remains current, and that funding reaches maximum impact.

Enactment of this bill will help improve a key DHS grant program and better secure our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 396, the Transit Security Grant Program Flexibility Act.

Whether it is bus systems, ferries, or passenger rail, the Transit Security Grant Program provides needed funds to transit agencies to protect critical surface transportation infrastructure and the traveling public from acts of terrorism.

Unfortunately, we have already witnessed multiple attacks across the globe: the 2005 bombing of the Tube in London, the 2016 metro station bombing in Brussels, and the 2017 New York Port Authority bombing.

With billions of riders using surface transportation annually, and limited security screening, it should come as no surprise that surface transportation has been and continues to be a terror

target. As such, we must ensure that first responders and transit agencies have the tools needed to secure our transit system.

The Transit Security Grant Program Flexibility Act seeks to address challenges associated with fluctuating periods of performance by codifying the period of performance at 36 months for the majority of eligible projects and extending it to 55 months for vital large-scale capital security projects. This ensures that these major projects can be successfully completed in the allotted time.

Additionally, while Transit Security Grant Program awards can be used to provide personnel with essential security training, recipients of awards are not currently permitted to use the grant program funds to pay for backfilling personnel attending such training. This may, in turn, inhibit some transit agencies from sending their staff to vital security training.

H.R. 396 will permit Transit Security Grant Program funds to be used for this purpose, consistent with other Homeland Security grant programs.

Given the evolving threat landscape, and the continued calls from extremist groups for lone-wolf attacks to target crowded areas, it is imperative that the Transit Security Grant Program provide flexible solutions for grant recipients in order to protect these soft targets and keep everyday commuters safe.

I am proud to continue the great work of former New York Members Dan Donovan and Peter King in introducing this important piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting H.R. 396, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, New York City has the largest public transit system in the country, and New York City has the greatest vulnerability to terrorism.

I thank my colleague, Congressman GARBARINO, for his leadership in advocating for transportation systems across the country.

H.R. 396 is a measure that this country needs. I believe all of us in this body can agree that securing America's transit systems is critical to homeland security, and so too must we invest to make and keep it safe.

Enactment of H.R. 396 would bolster the security of what, in the view of my constituents, is about as critical as critical infrastructure gets and protect these systems and their riders against terrorist attacks and targeted violence.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 396, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 396.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1527

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

IMPROVING FHA SUPPORT FOR SMALL-DOLLAR MORTGAGES ACT OF 2021

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1532) to require a review of the effects of FHA mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products on small-dollar mortgage lending, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1532

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving FHA Support for Small-Dollar Mortgages Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. REVIEW OF FHA SMALL-DOLLAR MORTGAGE PRACTICES.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) affordable homeownership opportunities are being hindered due to the lack of financing available for home purchases under \$70,000;

(2) according to the Urban Institute, small-dollar mortgage loan applications in 2017 were denied by lenders at double the rate of denial for large mortgage loans, and this difference in denial rates cannot be fully explained by differences in the applicants' credit profiles;

(3) according to data compiled by Attom Data solutions, small-dollar mortgage originations have decreased 38 percent since 2009, while there has been a 65-percent increase in origination of mortgages for more than \$150,000;

(4) the FHA's mission is to serve credit-worthy borrowers who are underserved and, according to the Urban Institute, the FHA serves 24 percent of the overall market, but only 19 percent of the small-dollar mortgage market; and

(5) the causes behind these variations are not fully understood, but merit study that could assist in furthering the Department of Housing and Urban Development's mission, including meeting the housing needs of borrowers the program is designed to serve and reducing barriers to homeownership, while

protecting the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

(b) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall conduct a review of its FHA single-family mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products to identify any barriers or impediments to supporting, facilitating, and making available mortgage insurance for mortgages having an original principal obligation of \$70,000 or less. Not later than the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress describing the findings of such review and the actions that the Secretary will take, without adversely affecting the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, to remove such barriers and impediments to providing mortgage insurance for such mortgages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, when it comes to promoting access to homeownership, much of the focus tends to be on how high housing prices are pricing many borrowers out of homeownership. But the landscape of homeownership opportunities is varied, and for many communities, the lack of access to traditional mortgage financing for small-dollar mortgages continues to be a major barrier.

Specifically, I am talking about mortgage financing for homes that are priced at \$70,000 or less. For many rural communities, and predominantly communities of color that are struggling to overcome the impacts of the foreclosure crisis, there are lower-value homes that would otherwise be ideal homeownership opportunities for first-time home buyers and working class families, but the lack of traditional mortgage financing options acts as a barrier to those opportunities.

□ 1530

Data from the Urban Institute shows that these small-dollar mortgages are denied by lenders at double the rate compared to larger loans, and this trend cannot be explained away by differences in the creditworthiness of applicants.

The bottom line is that lenders don't make as much money originating these smaller loans, so they are less likely to make loans on collateral that don't maximize their profit.

The Federal Housing Administration was designed to serve underserved markets and could be instrumental in promoting more small-dollar mortgage lending, but the data shows that the FHA is actually disproportionately failing to serve this market. So this bill would require the FHA to identify barriers to better serving the small-dollar mortgage market and to come up with an actionable plan to reduce those barriers.

This bill is desperately needed at a time when mortgage rates are at historic lows and home prices continue to rise. We must support affordable housing options for individual borrowers and their pursuit of the American Dream of homeownership.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1532.

Some studies suggest that small-dollar mortgages, which are amounts less than \$70,000, may be disproportionately denied compared to loans of higher amounts, even when credit profiles are similar.

If true, this could be an issue for families in my district and across the country who are trying to buy their first home, particularly in rural America.

H.R. 1532 is a bipartisan bill reported last Congress by the House Financial Services Committee that seeks to understand the challenges associated with small-dollar lending and why.

This bill asks the fundamental questions: Why not have the FHA review its own policies? Why shouldn't the FHA look to determine whether there are borrowers who would otherwise qualify for a mortgage and who are being left out of the market as an unintended consequence of the FHA's own regulations?

After all, the FHA's mission is to serve creditworthy borrowers who are underserved by the private market. This includes serving without bias as to how small a loan seeking insurance should be or might be.

Moreover, the FHA should understand whether its own regulations are hurting borrowers' access to credit and remedy the problem without affecting the health of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, which is at issue.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee, in particular Mr. CLEAVER and Ranking Member STIVERS, for bringing this issue to our attention and for their work on this important bill.

H.R. 1532 is a positive example of Congress identifying a problem and working together in a bipartisan way to understand the causes and to identify a reasonable solution.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I would inquire through the Chair if my colleague has any remaining speakers.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I do not.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Improving FHA Support for Small-Dollar Mortgages Act.

Housing is one of the most vital ways families have a shot at financial stability and freedom. However, affordable homeownership opportunities are being denied to my residents because of the lack of financing available for home purchases under \$70,000.

In fact, small-dollar mortgage loan applications in 2017 were denied by lenders at double the rate of denial for large mortgage loans. This is largely because the banks have decided that small-dollar mortgages are riskier because they rely on bogus credit score thresholds and the loans don't give them enough profit.

This impacts majority Black and Brown communities, as well as low-income communities that are unbanked and underbanked.

Madam Speaker, in my district alone, 68,000—or nearly 50 percent—of our owner-occupied homes are valued under \$70,000. Think about that for a second. Almost half of the homes in my district stand little chance of getting financing from a bank.

My bill directs the Department of Housing to report on barriers to making small-dollar mortgage insurance available for mortgages under \$70,000. It also requires HUD to report on policies, practices, and actions that will be taken to remove such barriers, to making available mortgage insurance for mortgages of \$70,000 or less.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please vote in support of my bill to ensure that every family has access to homeownership.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative TLAIB for her work on this important bill, as we work to improve access to affordable homeownership. This bill is an important step that will help us better understand and break down the barriers to obtaining traditional mortgage financing for small-dollar mortgages.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1532.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES FOR SERVICEMEMBERS ACT

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1491) to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to provide enhanced protection against debt collector harassment of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1491

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act”.

SEC. 2. ENHANCED PROTECTION AGAINST DEBT COLLECTOR HARASSMENT OF SERVICEMEMBERS.

(a) COMMUNICATION IN CONNECTION WITH DEBT COLLECTION.—Section 805 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING SERVICE-MEMBER DEBTS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered member’ means—

“(A) a covered member or a dependent as defined in section 987(i) of title 10, United States Code; and

“(B)(i) an individual who was separated, discharged, or released from duty described in such section 987(i)(1), but only during the 365-day period beginning on the date of separation, discharge, or release; or

“(ii) a person, with respect to an individual described in clause (i), described in subparagraph (A), (D), (E), or (I) of section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) PROHIBITIONS.—A debt collector may not, in connection with the collection of any debt of a covered member—

“(A) threaten to have the covered member reduced in rank;

“(B) threaten to have the covered member’s security clearance revoked; or

“(C) threaten to have the covered member prosecuted under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).”.

(b) UNFAIR PRACTICES.—Section 808 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The representation to any covered member (as defined under section 805(e)(1)) that failure to cooperate with a debt collector will result in—

“(A) a reduction in rank of the covered member;

“(B) a revocation of the covered member’s security clearance; or

“(C) prosecution under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).”.

SEC. 3. GAO STUDY.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress on the impact of this Act on—

(1) the timely delivery of information to a covered member (as defined in section 805(e) of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, as added by this Act);

(2) military readiness; and

(3) national security, including the extent to which covered members with security clearances would be impacted by uncollected debt.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative DEAN for her leadership on this important bill, which will provide much-needed relief and protection for our servicemembers.

Two out of every five servicemembers’ complaints submitted to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau are about predatory debt collection practices. Some examples of what servicemembers reported experiencing include inappropriate threats of punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, threats to the rank and security clearance of the servicemember, and even reports of debt collectors inappropriately contacting the commanding officer of the debt holder.

It is a disgrace that people serving in the military are being threatened and intimidated. The impact of these abusive collection practices is severe. Servicemembers have reported increased stress and hardship because of predatory debt collectors.

These unfair and unnecessary practices against people who are putting their lives on the line for this country must end, which is why the National Military Family Association; the National Consumer Law Center; and the former CFPB Assistant Director for Servicemember Affairs, retired Army Colonel Paul Kantwill, all support this bill.

I am happy to say that Democrats and Republicans agree that Congress should put a halt to these abusive practices, and this bill does just that. Congresswoman DEAN’s work across the

aisle and with the House Armed Services Committee last Congress resulted in a House floor vote of 355–0.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this bill again so we can better protect our servicemembers, who do so much to protect us.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1491, the Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act.

I thank Representative DEAN for offering this legislation.

Madam Speaker, our servicemembers put their lives on the line for us every day. To that end, we must ensure they are adequately protected from abuse or harassment related to outstanding debt. I am pleased that we were able to work in a bipartisan fashion to meet this goal.

H.R. 1491 prohibits debt collectors from using threats against a servicemember’s rank or security clearance, or threats of prosecution under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Not only are such practices unfair, they also create the risk of harm to military readiness.

Last Congress, during the committee markup of H.R. 1491, Republicans expressed concerns that there were too many unanswered questions about how this bill could impact military readiness. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who has had a distinguished career in our military, offered an amendment, which directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the impact this bill has on readiness with servicemembers regarding debts in collection, as well as military readiness and national security. This commonsense approach ensures that Congress understands and is able to account for the connection between national security and the protection of servicemembers from unfair practices.

Madam Speaker, I thank the Democrat majority for accepting this amendment, and I am glad that it continues to be included in this bill we are considering today. This makes this a far more lasting bill, I believe, and more impactful on the people that the author and this Congress want to ensure are taken care of, and those are the folks who serve and protect us each and every day.

As a reminder, this bill passed the House unanimously in March of last year.

All Americans deserve to be treated with dignity and respect when faced with repaying a debt. This is especially true for our servicemembers, who fight for our freedoms every day.

Madam Speaker, this bill contains important safeguards. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman

from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), who is also the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I also thank the ranking member and the committee in its entirety for working on this bill together. It is a sign of bipartisanship, one that I can be proud of and we can all be proud of.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1491, the Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act.

Every day, we are reminded of the significant sacrifices our troops make to protect us. As Members of Congress, I believe we have a responsibility to protect those who protect us.

The Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act works to live up to this responsibility by addressing abusive debt collection practices specifically targeting servicemembers.

According to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, approximately 40 percent of complaints filed by servicemembers concern debt collection, as compared to only 26 percent by nonservicemembers. These debt collection practices are manipulative and have negative career implications for soldiers, like contacting their superior officers or threatening them with rank reductions.

Unfortunately, these practices do not stop with the servicemembers. Debt collectors also target military spouses, unfairly burdening our military families who have sacrificed so much.

These tactics are egregious and must stop. Our servicemen and -women make extraordinary sacrifices on our behalf. The last thing they need is harassment from debt collectors who take advantage of their service, which is why I am pleased to rise in support of the bill today.

□ 1545

Specifically, my bill amends the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act and prohibits a debt collector from communicating with a servicemember's chain of command or a dependent for the purpose of threatening to have their rank reduced or threatening to revoke their security clearance.

This legislation will help ensure that our military families are not unnecessarily targeted and shield them from bad practices from debt collectors. We recognize our servicemembers' spirit of service, and we must do our part to be of service to them.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members, as they did last Congress, to support the Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I commend Congresswoman DEAN for her excellent work on H.R. 1491 to help ensure our servicemembers are not threatened or harassed by unscrupulous debt collectors.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support our servicemembers by voting "yes" on H.R. 1491, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1491, the "Fair Debt Collection for Servicemembers Act," which addresses abusive debt collection practices affecting members of the military by amending the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) by adding servicemember-specific provisions to Section 805 (covering prohibited communications in connection with debt collection) and 808 (defining unfair practices that constitute a violation of the Act).

H.R. 1491 specifically prohibits debt collectors from making threats of rank reduction, revocation of security clearance or prosecution under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Further, the bill requires the Government Accountability Office to report the impact of this act on military readiness and national security, including the extent covered members with security clearances would be impacted by uncollected debt.

While all Americans are covered by laws barring debt collectors from overly aggressive or deceptive tactics, military members and their families face particular financial challenges requiring extra protections: in service to their country, they relocate frequently, deploy overseas and are a prime target for scammers.

Military members are also more vulnerable to debt collectors in some instances, and debt collectors have taken advantage of this vulnerability by targeting members of the Armed Services through calling their superior officers, threatening reduction in rank and even courts-martial.

This past year has seen a rise in aggressive debt collections due to the impact of COVID-19, according to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ("CFPB").

According to the CFPB, in the past year credit and consumer reporting complaints accounted for more than 58 percent of complaints received by the CFPB, followed by debt collection (15 percent), credit card (7 percent), checking or savings (6 percent), and mortgage complaints (5 percent).

Nearly 40 percent of complaints filed by servicemembers with the CFPB concern debt collection—as compared to only 26 percent by non-servicemembers.

This pandemic has been among the most disruptive long-term events we will see in our lifetimes, and it is not surprising that the shockwaves it sent across the planet were felt deeply in the consumer financial marketplace.

Our servicemen and servicewomen make extraordinary sacrifices on our behalf, and they should not be forced to confront aggressive and manipulative debt collectors who capitalize on the strains required of them in the course of their duties.

It is critical for the United States Congress to stand with the women and men who have served our country and remove the unethical methods debt collectors use to prey upon our servicemembers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1491, and address these abusive debt collection practices; the patriots serving our country deserve no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts

(Ms. PRESSLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1491.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

HOUSING FINANCIAL LITERACY ACT OF 2021

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1395) to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to discount FHA single-family mortgage insurance premium payments for first-time homebuyers who complete a financial literacy housing counseling program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. DISCOUNT ON MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUM PAYMENTS FOR FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYERS WHO COMPLETE FINANCIAL LITERACY HOUSING COUNSELING PROGRAMS.

The second sentence of subparagraph (A) of section 203(c)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(c)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the comma the following: "and such program is completed before the mortgagor has signed an application for a mortgage to be insured under this title or a sales agreement"; and

(2) by striking "not exceed 2.75 percent of the amount of the original insured principal obligation of the mortgage" and inserting "be 25 basis points lower than the premium payment amount established by the Secretary under the first sentence of this subparagraph".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1395, the Housing Financial Literacy Act, a bipartisan bill authored by

Representative BEATTY who is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion. The bill is also cosponsored by Representative STIVERS.

This bill would incentivize prospective home buyers to undergo housing counseling by offering a discount on FHA-backed mortgages for doing so. Research has consistently demonstrated that loans made to borrowers who have received pre-purchase counseling perform better than loans made to comparable borrowers who did not receive pre-purchase counseling on their mortgage.

When borrowers are able to stay current on their mortgage payments, lenders save money too. A 2013 study by Freddie Mac found that when 90-day delinquencies were lowered by 29 percent, lenders saved an average of \$1,000 per loan. So this bill would not only benefit consumers during an environment of historically low mortgage rates, it would also help further improve the financial health of the FHA.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative BEATTY for her leadership on this commonsense, data-driven bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1395, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for all of her hard work on H.R. 1395, the Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2021.

The Federal Housing Administration, FHA, currently provides government-backed mortgage insurance to more than \$1.3 trillion in loans. FHA insurance allows a wide array of borrowers to qualify for mortgages. This includes many low- and moderate-income families who might not otherwise have access to credit through traditional underwriting.

In fiscal year 2020, the FHA insured over 800,000 forward mortgage purchase loans, with more than 83 percent going to first-time home buyers. Given the large population of first-time home buyers using FHA, it makes sense to encourage those individuals to seek out ways to strengthen their financial knowledge and better prepare them for the challenges of homeownership.

Right now, current law states that FHA has the ability to provide first-time homeowners with a discount on their FHA upfront premiums. However, the homeowner must complete an approved homeownership financial counseling course.

Yet, the statute is drafted in such a way that the provision only applies in particular circumstances. This includes when FHA upfront premiums exceed 2.75 percent. Since FHA upfront premiums are currently set at 1.75 percent, the rate has not been exceeded in a decade. Thus, FHA does not currently provide an upfront premium discount to first-time home buyers who complete a financial counseling course.

H.R. 1395 would amend current law to require FHA to provide a one-quarter percent upfront premium discount, from the prevailing rate, in order to help those first-time home buyers get financial literacy and then get the discount. This equates to about \$625 of savings off the current premium structure on a \$250,000 mortgage. This is not an insignificant amount.

Given the nature of this, I think it is great to have a financial benefit for people understanding financial consequences. I think there are many other areas in our government that would benefit from this type of thinking.

The hope is that by making such a discount mandatory, more first-time home buyers will seek out financial literacy counseling which, in turn, will produce better outcomes for a traditionally at-risk group of home buyers.

The bottom line is that FHA is a valuable tool to help expand the universe of mortgage credit in our housing system. We ought to be doing all that we can to ensure that we are using our limited public resources to encourage all borrowers to be well-prepared for the commitments of homeownership through financial counseling or through other effective means of creating more stable and reliable borrowers.

So I think this is a very good bill thoughtfully done by Mrs. BEATTY, and it is bipartisan, coming out of committee last Congress.

Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers. I urge its adoption, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for pushing this bill forward.

This bill incentivizes financial literacy that will help avoid delinquencies and lower the upfront cost of homeownership for so many.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, for many generations, the idea of the American Dream has been homeownership. Yet the goal for many Americans of owning the place they call home is more distant than ever before. It doesn't just require savings and a good credit score anymore—but also a strong financial plan to ensure that you can hold on to it for the years to follow.

That is why I am proud today to support H.R. 1395, the Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2021. This bill, introduced by my good friend and chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman Joyce Beatty of Ohio, provides a financial incentive for first-time homebuyers who choose to take a financial literacy course by providing a discount on mortgage insurance through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA).

This bill would greatly benefit first-time homebuyers by not just saving them money during the homebuying process, but also pro-

viding them the tools needed to build a strong financial plan. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and hope the Senate will swiftly pass this bill so that first-time homebuyers are able to benefit from this opportunity as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1395.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

NATIONAL SENIOR INVESTOR INITIATIVE ACT OF 2021

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1565) to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1565

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Senior Investor Initiative Act of 2021" or the "Senior Security Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. SENIOR INVESTOR TASKFORCE.

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) SENIOR INVESTOR TASKFORCE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Commission the Senior Investor Taskforce (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Taskforce’).

“(2) DIRECTOR OF THE TASKFORCE.—The head of the Taskforce shall be the Director, who shall—

“(A) report directly to the Chairman; and

“(B) be appointed by the Chairman, in consultation with the Commission, from among individuals—

“(i) currently employed by the Commission or from outside of the Commission; and

“(ii) having experience in advocating for the interests of senior investors.

“(3) STAFFING.—The Chairman shall ensure that—

“(A) the Taskforce is staffed sufficiently to carry out fully the requirements of this subsection; and

“(B) such staff shall include individuals from the Division of Enforcement, Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations, and Office of Investor Education and Advocacy.

“(4) NO COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF TASKFORCE.—All members of the Taskforce appointed under paragraph (2) or (3) shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

“(5) MINIMIZING DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—In organizing and staffing the Taskforce, the Chairman shall take such actions as may be

necessary to minimize the duplication of efforts within the divisions and offices described under paragraph (3)(B) and any other divisions, offices, or taskforces of the Commission.

“(6) FUNCTIONS OF THE TASKFORCE.—The Taskforce shall—

“(A) identify challenges that senior investors encounter, including problems associated with financial exploitation and cognitive decline;

“(B) identify areas in which senior investors would benefit from changes in the regulations of the Commission or the rules of self-regulatory organizations;

“(C) coordinate, as appropriate, with other offices within the Commission, other taskforces that may be established within the Commission, self-regulatory organizations, and the Elder Justice Coordinating Council; and

“(D) consult, as appropriate, with State securities and law enforcement authorities, State insurance regulators, and other Federal agencies.

“(7) REPORT.—The Taskforce, in coordination, as appropriate, with the Office of the Investor Advocate and self-regulatory organizations, and in consultation, as appropriate, with State securities and law enforcement authorities, State insurance regulators, and Federal agencies, shall issue a report every 2 years to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the first of which shall not be issued until after the report described in section 3 of the National Senior Investor Initiative Act of 2021 has been issued and considered by the Taskforce, containing—

“(A) appropriate statistical information and full and substantive analysis;

“(B) a summary of recent trends and innovations that have impacted the investment landscape for senior investors;

“(C) a summary of regulatory initiatives that have concentrated on senior investors and industry practices related to senior investors;

“(D) key observations, best practices, and areas needing improvement, involving senior investors identified during examinations, enforcement actions, and investor education outreach;

“(E) a summary of the most serious issues encountered by senior investors, including issues involving financial products and services;

“(F) an analysis with regard to existing policies and procedures of brokers, dealers, investment advisers, and other market participants related to senior investors and senior investor-related topics and whether these policies and procedures need to be further developed or refined;

“(G) recommendations for such changes to the regulations, guidance, and orders of the Commission and self-regulatory organizations and such legislative actions as may be appropriate to resolve problems encountered by senior investors; and

“(H) any other information, as determined appropriate by the Director of the Taskforce.

“(8) REQUEST FOR REPORTS.—The Taskforce shall make any report issued under paragraph (7) available to a Member of Congress who requests such a report.

“(9) SUNSET.—The Taskforce shall terminate after the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(10) SENIOR INVESTOR DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘senior investor’ means an investor over the age of 65.

“(11) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—The Commission shall use existing funds to carry out this subsection.”.

SEC. 3. GAO STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and the Senior Investor Taskforce the results of a study of financial exploitation of senior citizens.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include information with respect to—

(1) economic costs of the financial exploitation of senior citizens—

(A) associated with losses by victims that were incurred as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens;

(B) incurred by State and Federal agencies, law enforcement and investigatory agencies, public benefit programs, public health programs, and other public programs as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens;

(C) incurred by the private sector as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(D) any other relevant costs that—

(i) result from the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(ii) the Comptroller General determines are necessary and appropriate to include in order to provide Congress and the public with a full and accurate understanding of the economic costs resulting from the financial exploitation of senior citizens in the United States;

(2) frequency of senior financial exploitation and correlated or contributing factors—

(A) information about percentage of senior citizens financially exploited each year; and

(B) information about factors contributing to increased risk of exploitation, including such factors as race, social isolation, income, net worth, religion, region, occupation, education, home-ownership, illness, and loss of spouse; and

(3) policy responses and reporting of senior financial exploitation—

(A) the degree to which financial exploitation of senior citizens unreported to authorities;

(B) the reasons that financial exploitation may be unreported to authorities;

(C) to the extent that suspected elder financial exploitation is currently being reported—

(i) information regarding which Federal, State, and local agencies are receiving reports, including adult protective services, law enforcement, industry, regulators, and professional licensing boards;

(ii) information regarding what information is being collected by such agencies; and

(iii) information regarding the actions that are taken by such agencies upon receipt of the report and any limits on the agencies’ ability to prevent exploitation, such as jurisdictional limits, a lack of expertise, resource challenges, or limiting criteria with regard to the types of victims they are permitted to serve;

(D) an analysis of gaps that may exist in empowering Federal, State, and local agencies to prevent senior exploitation or respond effectively to suspected senior financial exploitation; and

(E) an analysis of the legal hurdles that prevent Federal, State, and local agencies from effectively partnering with each other and private professionals to effectively respond to senior financial exploitation.

(c) SENIOR CITIZEN DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “senior citizen” means an individual over the age of 65.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1565, the Senior Security Act of 2021, which would help protect America’s senior investors who can be disproportionately vulnerable to investment-related frauds.

In 2017 alone, State securities regulators conducted nearly 4,709 investigations, leading to more than 2,100 enforcement actions, including 255 criminal prosecutions. These actions have resulted in approximately \$486 million in restitution for harmed investors, nearly \$79 million in fines and/or penalties, and 1,985 years in incarceration or probation being ordered.

The National Council on Aging estimated that elder financial abuse and fraud costs older Americans from \$2.9 billion to \$36.5 billion annually. Moreover, in a February bulletin, the FINRA, the NASAA, and the SEC’s Office of Investor Education and Advocacy noted that COVID-19’s unprecedented quarantines and social isolation may leave senior investors even more susceptible to financial fraud than ever before.

This bill would establish a Senior Investor Task Force within the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. In coordination and consultation with State securities administrators, self-regulatory organizations, Federal law enforcement agencies, and others, the task force would be charged with identifying issues related to investors who are older than 65 years of age. The bill would also require biennial task force reports and require the GAO to complete a study on senior financial exploitation.

I strongly support the safety of America’s senior investors and their right to enjoy the retirement funds that they have worked so hard to earn. I also support regulators and law enforcement in holding fraudsters who prey upon the elderly accountable.

It is for all these reasons I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Senior Security Act of 2021.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1565, the Senior Security Act.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH of Indiana and Mr. GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey for their work on this important piece of bipartisan legislation that will strengthen current efforts to protect senior investors.

Madam Speaker, American capital markets provide every mom-and-pop investor with the opportunity to realize the American Dream. Our capital markets allow individuals and families to grow their nest egg for retirement, their children to have an opportunity for college tuition, or to save and purchase a home.

Moreover, as Americans age, they are an important part of the success and vibrancy of the U.S. capital markets. In fact, Americans over the age of 50 already account for roughly 77 percent of financial assets in the United States. To that end, fraud and exploitation of any kind in our capital markets threatens the integrity of our markets and harm investors seeking to build their nest eggs.

It is especially problematic when the fraud targets senior investors. Protecting senior investors and preventing such predatory behavior within our financial markets is a goal that we all share, regardless of party. This bill will support the Securities and Exchange Commission's current efforts to protect against increasing instances of financial exploitation against senior investors.

H.R. 1565 creates an interdivisional task force at the Securities and Exchange Commission to examine and identify challenges faced by senior investors.

We already have some data on senior citizens who are targeted by financial exploitation. These statistics are alarming. Older Americans lose up to \$36 billion each year to financial scams and abuse. One in five seniors have reported being victims of exploitation, and only a small number of cases of financial abuse are even reported. The rates of exploitation are only rising. In fact, The New England Journal of Medicine calls elder financial exploitation a virtual epidemic.

There are concerns that the COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated the trend. In addition to Congress, many States are already taking action, and that is a good thing.

This bipartisan bill is an important step for the Federal Government. The bill requires the SEC to identify current issues and challenges facing senior investors and to make policy recommendations for addressing these issues harming senior investors.

Madam Speaker, protecting senior investors and safeguarding the integrity of our financial markets are objectives I believe we can get behind. In our duty to protect our constituents, especially those most vulnerable who contribute so much to society, we need to be helpful and supportive. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of the bipartisan Senior Security Act, which will help protect vulnerable seniors from hucksters and scam artists. I would like to thank my good friend, Congressman TREY HOLLINGSWORTH, for working with me on this crucial bill, and also Senators SUSAN COLLINS and KYRSTEN SINEMA, who have introduced companion legislation in the Senate.

Since I took office, I have been committed to helping seniors save their hard-earned money for retirement, helping them cut their taxes and afford prescription drugs, and protecting Social Security and Medicare so that, at the end of the day, they can afford to stay in northern New Jersey and enjoy their lives with their friends, children, and grandchildren.

Unfortunately, far too many of our seniors have had their hard-earned retirement savings stolen right out from under them when a scammer calls or shows up at their door. There are millions of seniors across the country who have been the victims of financial scams and abuses. It is appalling; it is offensive; and it is unacceptable.

Older Americans lose approximately \$3 billion each year to financial scams and abuse. Approximately 7 million Americans have been victims of exploitation, and that is only what is being reported. Only 1 in every 24 cases of elder abuse actually gets reported.

IRS impersonation calls and fraudulent tech support calls are among the most widely used and costly scams targeting older Americans. In fact, more than 2.5 million Americans have been targeted by scammers impersonating IRS officials, costing more than 15,800 taxpayers at least \$80 million since 2013. More than 3 million Americans are victims of tech support scams or scammers pretending to be with a reputable tech company who persuade seniors to provide personal bank account information.

My mom was even a victim of one of these scammers. Someone claiming to be an IRS agent threatened her. I remember she called me and thought that I had messed up her tax return, but it was a scammer.

COVID scammers are also now targeting older Americans with promises of quicker access to vaccines or pandemic relief benefits, preying on those whose only wish is to hug their family members again.

We are here today to do something about it by voting on the Senior Security Act to help protect American seniors from scams. My bipartisan bill creates a new senior investor task force at the SEC to fight back against these hucksters scamming our seniors. The task force will also identify challenges that senior investors encounter and areas within the SEC or self-regulatory

organizations where senior investors would benefit from changes.

The task force will also coordinate with other Federal regulators, State regulators, and law enforcement to ensure that we are doing as much as we can at every level of government to stop this. Our legislation will also make antifraud enforcement even more common by giving law enforcement stronger tools and information via the new senior investor task force.

The task force will submit regular reports to Congress, outlining trends that are impacting senior investors. This will be a cop on the beat to make sure we keep up with the changes in financial scams and to be ahead of new issues as they arise.

Our seniors have given us so much. We should always have their backs and help protect them from predators who want to take advantage of them during their twilight years. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), the coauthor of this bill.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

As I travel the district and travel across the State, I constantly get asked two very important questions: What is Washington doing for Americans? And, what is happening on a bipartisan basis in Washington, D.C.?

When I travel back home this Thursday, I will be able to answer that this legislation checks both of those boxes. I am deeply proud to work with my good friend, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, on this important legislation to keep our senior citizens safe from fraudsters and hucksters who are constantly pursuing them.

Much has been spoken already in this Chamber about the "what" of this bill, but I wanted to emphasize the "why."

It is for the 74-year-old Hoosier walking through our Jeffersonville office who has lost her life savings because she thought she was interfacing with the IRS.

It is for the senior couple walking through our Franklin doors thinking they were helping get their grandson out of jail but, instead, were dealing with a huckster.

It is for all the senior citizens across this country who are constantly getting the calls, constantly getting the phishing emails, constantly seeing text messages trying to get at their life savings. Those are the ones who report it. As Mr. GOTTHEIMER said, only 1 in 24 of these crimes gets reported.

This is something we have to end. We have to get one step ahead. I can't wait to travel back home to the Hoosier State later this week and tell them this Chamber advanced a piece of legislation to protect our senior citizens, to protect Americans, and to get us one step ahead of those fraudsters.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ).

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1565, the Senior Security Act.

This commonsense legislation will provide much-needed information for policymakers and regulators to fine-tune protections for elderly investors.

In south Texas, where we share the deep value of respect for our elders, we say society is judged on how we care for our parents, our grandparents, and beyond. We all know how closely financial health is tied to overall well-being. I am proud to support this legislation that equips us to identify better ways to protect our senior citizens and for them to protect themselves from fraud and scammers.

This Senior Security Act aims to protect our seniors and prevent these attacks from happening. This legislation will build upon the Senior Safe Act by creating an interdivisional task force at the Securities and Exchange Commission to examine and identify challenges facing seniors and investors.

Within 2 years of enactment, the U.S. Government Accountability Office must study and report the economic costs of the financial exploitation of our seniors. Let's be clear: Scammers will stop at nothing to take advantage of our seniors, and it is up to us in this House to stop them.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my congressional colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I urge its passage.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1565 will help our financial regulators better protect our Nation's seniors and the retirement funds they spent their entire lives building. I urge all of my colleagues to stand up for senior investors and vote "yes" on H.R. 1865.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1565, the "Senior Security Act," which will help stop financial predators from scamming seniors out of their savings by creating a federal Senior Investor Taskforce within the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to strengthen protections and safeguards for senior investors.

This legislation will establish the Senior Investor Taskforce at the SEC, which will be charged with identifying problems senior investors encounter, including financial exploitation and cognitive decline, as well as identifying regulatory changes that could help senior investors.

The established Senior Investor Taskforce will be required to:

Identify challenges that senior investors encounter, including problems associated with financial exploitation and cognitive decline;

Identify areas in which senior investors would benefit from changes at the Commission or the rules of self-regulatory organizations;

Coordinate, as appropriate, with other offices within the Commission and other

taskforces that may be established within the Commission, self-regulatory organizations, and the Elder Justice Coordinating Council;

Consult, as appropriate, with state securities and law enforcement authorities, state insurance regulators, and other federal agencies; and

Submit a biennial report to Congress.

Every day, and far too often, vulnerable seniors in Texas and across the country fall victim to financial scammers.

Seniors have worked their entire lives with the promise of a safe and secure retirement, but unfortunately criminals are taking advantage of uncertainty surrounding the pandemic and working overtime to target them.

No senior should ever have to worry that picking up the phone could mean being scammed out of thousands of dollars, but unfortunately, for too many members of our communities, that is exactly what is happening.

Retirement accounts are not the only damage these scams target—they damage the independence and trust of a vulnerable community.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen instances of fraud rise in unprecedented numbers, as scammers attempt to take advantage of senior citizens and deprive them of their hard-earned savings.

Bad actors preying on older Americans is, unfortunately, nothing new, but in the midst of a global pandemic impacting Americans' lives and livelihoods, cracking down on those scams must be a priority.

One such scam was thwarted by Houston police and the Harris County District Attorney, who made an arrest in February in an international cyber-scam that bilked unsuspecting, mostly elderly victims out of more than \$1 million.

According to a report from the Senate Special Committee on Aging released last Congress, older Americans lose approximately \$3 billion each year to financial scams and abuse.

Although 1 in 20 seniors in the U.S. is a target of fraud schemes, the National Adult Protective Services Association has found that only 1 in 44 seniors report that they are victims of a fraud scheme.

Fraudulent IRS impersonation and tech support calls are among the common and costly scams, and according to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, more than 2.5 million Americans have been targeted by scammers impersonating IRS officials.

Since 2013, more than 15,800 taxpayers have lost at least \$80 million from this type of scam alone.

Furthermore, Microsoft estimates that more than 3 million Americans are victims of technical support scams, where scammers pretend to be with a reputable tech company and persuade seniors to provide personal and bank information.

Although we do know a few statistics, the lack of good, recent data on senior financial exploitation is a problem that H.R. 1565 would significantly aid in resolving.

For this reason, I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1565, the Fraud and Scam Reduction Act, which is critical to protecting seniors' hard-earned savings and stopping fraudulent schemes before it is too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAKANO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from

Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1565.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PROMOTING TRANSPARENT STANDARDS FOR CORPORATE INSIDERS ACT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1528) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of Rule 10b5-1 trading plans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1528

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act".

SEC. 2. SEC STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of whether Rule 10b5-1 (17 CFR 240.10b5-1) should be amended to—

(A) limit the ability of issuers and issuer insiders to adopt a plan described under paragraph (c)(1)(i)(A)(3) of Rule 10b5-1 ("trading plan") to a time when the issuer or issuer insider is permitted to buy or sell securities during issuer-adopted trading windows;

(B) limit the ability of issuers and issuer insiders to adopt multiple trading plans;

(C) establish a mandatory delay between the adoption of a trading plan and the execution of the first trade pursuant to such a plan and, if so and depending on the Commission's findings with respect to subparagraph (A)—

(i) whether any such delay should be the same for trading plans adopted during an issuer-adopted trading window as opposed to outside of such a window; and

(ii) whether any exceptions to such a delay are appropriate;

(D) limit the frequency that issuers and issuer insiders may modify or cancel trading plans;

(E) require issuers and issuer insiders to file with the Commission trading plan adoptions, amendments, terminations and transactions; or

(F) require boards of issuers that have adopted a trading plan to—

(i) adopt policies covering trading plan practices;

(ii) periodically monitor trading plan transactions; and

(iii) ensure that issuer policies discuss trading plan use in the context of guidelines or requirements on equity hedging, holding, and ownership.

(2) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the study required under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider—

(A) how any such amendments may clarify and enhance existing prohibitions against insider trading;

(B) the impact any such amendments may have on the ability of issuers to attract persons to become an issuer insider;

(C) the impact any such amendments may have on capital formation;

(D) the impact any such amendments may have on an issuer's willingness to operate as a public company; and

(E) any other consideration that the Commission considers necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under section (a).

(c) RULEMAKING.—After the completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall, subject to public notice and comment, revise Rule 10b5-1 consistent with the results of such study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1528, the Promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act, is a bill introduced by Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS for several Congresses to strengthen confidence in our capital markets by ensuring everyone plays by the same rules.

This bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in the last Congress and is designed to promote strong enforcement against financial fraud by ensuring corporate executives cannot indirectly or illegally trade on material nonpublic information they know about their companies.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, the SEC, prohibits insider trading as a fraud that hurts investors as well as the integrity of our capital markets. Those accused of illegal insider trading sometimes defend themselves using the SEC's rule for trading plans and claim any trades that occurred while they possessed inside information were made pursuant to a preapproved trading plan. But the rule for trading plans has several shortcomings and loopholes that may allow corporate insiders to get away with insider trading.

This bill would require the SEC to study whether to amend its rule for trading plans to limit the ability of corporate insiders to, for example, adopt multiple overlapping plans or change their plans to indirectly take advantage of inside information. This bill would then require the SEC to report to Congress and revise its rules based on the results of the study.

This bill is needed to protect confidence in our markets. For example, last year, we saw numerous pharmaceutical executives profiting from conveniently timed announcements regarding the companies' progress toward a COVID-19 vaccine.

For instance, shortly after Moderna announced positive results for its vaccine, the pharmaceutical company's CEO altered his trading plan to increase the number of shares sold through the plan. Shortly thereafter, he sold shares for millions of dollars in profit.

Similarly, on the same day Pfizer announced positive data regarding its vaccine, Pfizer's CEO sold more than \$5 million worth of shares as part of his trading plan.

This bill is supported by investor and consumer advocates, public pension funds, and State securities regulators, including the California Public Employees' Retirement System, the Council of Institutional Investors, and the North American Securities Administrators Association.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1528, the Promoting Transparent Standards for Corporate Insiders Act.

As my colleague stated, this is bipartisan legislation that strikes an important balance. It protects retail investors in the market from illicit insider trading while, at the same time, ensuring that the rules governing insider trading are clear, fair, and not prohibitively onerous.

I thank my colleagues for supporting this bill last Congress, and I think they should do so this Congress. Thwarting and punishing fraud and abuse within our financial markets is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This includes illegal insider trading. When a corporate insider gains an unfair advantage by violating current insider trading rules and trading on material nonpublic information, that illegal behavior harms Main Street investors.

□ 1615

It harms those who diligently put their hard-earned money aside for retirement.

It is important to note that not every corporate insider or executive trading in the stock of his or her company is a bad actor. The Securities and Exchange Commission's current rules and guidelines allow corporate insiders to pur-

chase and sell securities of their company without fear of insider trading liability. Most corporate insiders carefully follow this rule called rule 10b5-1, and they follow it to the letter of the law.

Moreover, this rule ensures that insider trading guidelines are fair tools when properly followed. These rules are designed to allow corporate insiders to liquidate their stock options when needed, such as when trying to pay for a child's education, buying a house, or paying medical expenses.

Furthermore, allowing insiders to purchase and sell securities at a predetermined time on a scheduled basis under rule 10b5-1 ensures market stability.

This rule also decreases the risk of volatility by preventing fraudulent behavior, such as the so-called pump-and-dump schemes that some have tried to take advantage of.

This bill requires the SEC to study whether this current rule should be amended. In studying the rule, the SEC is directed to consider how any amendments would clarify and enhance existing prohibitions against insider trading. Importantly, though, the bill also requires the SEC to weigh any potential amendments against the important benefits of this rule.

The SEC is also directed to consider what effects amending the rules would have on attracting qualified candidates for open insider positions, such as capital formation, and a company's willingness to go public.

I am pleased that this is a bipartisan legislation that thoughtfully balances the meaningful goals of protecting everyday investors with facilitating economic growth opportunities, and I think that ensures that we keep a healthy capital markets function here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on my side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1528, which will help prevent corporate insiders from using inside information to rig the game in their favor at the expense of investors and the integrity of our markets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1528.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

SECURE AND FAIR ENFORCEMENT BANKING ACT OF 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1996) to create protections for financial institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; PURPOSE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Secure And Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2021” or the “SAFE Banking Act of 2021”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents; purpose.
- Sec. 2. Safe harbor for depository institutions.
- Sec. 3. Protections for ancillary businesses.
- Sec. 4. Protections under Federal law.
- Sec. 5. Rules of construction.
- Sec. 6. Requirements for filing suspicious activity reports.
- Sec. 7. Guidance and examination procedures.
- Sec. 8. Annual diversity and inclusion report.
- Sec. 9. GAO study on diversity and inclusion.
- Sec. 10. GAO study on effectiveness of certain reports on finding certain persons.
- Sec. 11. Application of this Act with respect to hemp-related legitimate businesses and hemp-related service providers.
- Sec. 12. Banking services for hemp-related legitimate businesses and hemp-related service providers.
- Sec. 13. Requirements for deposit account termination requests and orders.
- Sec. 14. Definitions.
- Sec. 15. Discretionary surplus funds.

(c) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this Act is to increase public safety by ensuring access to financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers and reducing the amount of cash at such businesses.

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A Federal banking regulator may not—

(1) terminate or limit the deposit insurance or share insurance of a depository institution under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.), the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), or take any other adverse action against a depository institution under section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818) solely because the depository institution provides or has provided financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(2) prohibit, penalize, or otherwise discourage a depository institution from providing financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider or to a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian Tribe that exercises jurisdiction over cannabis-related legitimate businesses;

(3) recommend, incentivize, or encourage a depository institution not to offer financial

services to an account holder, or to downgrade or cancel the financial services offered to an account holder solely because—

(A) the account holder is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or is an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(B) the account holder later becomes an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider; or

(C) the depository institution was not aware that the account holder is an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(4) take any adverse or corrective supervisory action on a loan made to—

(A) a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, solely because the business is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider;

(B) an employee, owner, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, solely because the employee, owner, or operator is employed by, owns, or operates a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, as applicable; or

(C) an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, solely because the owner or operator of the real estate or equipment leased the equipment or real estate to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, as applicable; or

(5) prohibit or penalize a depository institution (or entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution) for, or otherwise discourage a depository institution (or entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution) from, engaging in a financial service for a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.

(b) **SAFE HARBOR APPLICABLE TO DE NOVO INSTITUTIONS.**—Subsection (a) shall apply to an institution applying for a depository institution charter to the same extent as such subsection applies to a depository institution.

SEC. 3. PROTECTIONS FOR ANCILLARY BUSINESSES.

For the purposes of sections 1956 and 1957 of title 18, United States Code, and all other provisions of Federal law, the proceeds from a transaction involving activities of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider shall not be considered proceeds from an unlawful activity solely because—

(1) the transaction involves proceeds from a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider; or

(2) the transaction involves proceeds from—

(A) cannabis-related activities described in section 14(4)(B) conducted by a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

(B) activities described in section 14(13)(A) conducted by a service provider.

SEC. 4. PROTECTIONS UNDER FEDERAL LAW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to providing a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business (where such cannabis-related legitimate business operates within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable) or a service provider (wherever located), a depository institution, entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution, or insurer that provides

a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, and the officers, directors, and employees of that depository institution, entity, or insurer may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law or regulation—

(1) solely for providing such a financial service; or

(2) for further investing any income derived from such a financial service.

(b) **PROTECTIONS FOR FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.**—With respect to providing a service to a depository institution that provides a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business (where such cannabis-related legitimate business operates within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable) or service provider (wherever located), a Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank, and the officers, directors, and employees of the Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank, may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law or regulation—

(1) solely for providing such a service; or

(2) for further investing any income derived from such a service.

(c) **PROTECTIONS FOR INSURERS.**—With respect to engaging in the business of insurance within a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to a law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country, as applicable, an insurer that engages in the business of insurance with a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider or who otherwise engages with a person in a transaction permissible under State law related to cannabis, and the officers, directors, and employees of that insurer may not be held liable pursuant to any Federal law or regulation—

(1) solely for engaging in the business of insurance; or

(2) for further investing any income derived from the business of insurance.

(d) **FORFEITURE.**—

(1) **DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.**—A depository institution that has a legal interest in the collateral for a loan or another financial service provided to an owner, employee, or operator of a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or to an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, shall not be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeiture of that legal interest pursuant to any Federal law for providing such loan or other financial service.

(2) **FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS.**—A Federal reserve bank or Federal Home Loan Bank that has a legal interest in the collateral for a loan or another financial service provided to a depository institution that provides a financial service to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, or to an owner or operator of real estate or equipment that is leased or sold to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, shall not be subject to criminal, civil, or administrative forfeiture of that legal interest pursuant to any Federal law for providing such loan or other financial service.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **NO REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SERVICES.**—Nothing in this Act shall require

a depository institution, entity performing a financial service for or in association with a depository institution, or insurer to provide financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business, service provider, or any other business.

(b) **GENERAL EXAMINATION, SUPERVISORY, AND ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed in any way as limiting or otherwise restricting the general examination, supervisory, and enforcement authority of the Federal banking regulators, provided that the basis for any supervisory or enforcement action is not the provision of financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.

(c) **BUSINESS OF INSURANCE.**—Nothing in this Act shall interfere with the regulation of the business of insurance in accordance with the Act of March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33, chapter 20; 15 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) (commonly known as the “McCarran-Ferguson Act”) and the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY REPORTS.

Section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **REQUIREMENTS FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to a financial institution or any director, officer, employee, or agent of a financial institution that reports a suspicious transaction pursuant to this subsection, if the reason for the report relates to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider, the report shall comply with appropriate guidance issued by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall update the February 14, 2014, guidance titled ‘BSA Expectations Regarding Marijuana-Related Businesses’ (FIN-2014-G001) to ensure that the guidance is consistent with the purpose and intent of the SAFE Banking Act of 2021 and does not significantly inhibit the provision of financial services to a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider in a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian country that has allowed the cultivation, production, manufacture, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, sale, or purchase of cannabis pursuant to law or regulation of such State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country.

“(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) **CANNABIS.**—The term ‘cannabis’ has the meaning given the term ‘marihuana’ in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

“(ii) **CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.**—The term ‘cannabis-related legitimate business’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2021.

“(iii) **INDIAN COUNTRY.**—The term ‘Indian country’ has the meaning given that term in section 1151 of title 18.

“(iv) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

“(v) **FINANCIAL SERVICE.**—The term ‘financial service’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2021.

“(vi) **SERVICE PROVIDER.**—The term ‘service provider’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the SAFE Banking Act of 2021.

“(vii) **STATE.**—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,

and any territory or possession of the United States.”.

SEC. 7. GUIDANCE AND EXAMINATION PROCEDURES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Financial Institutions Examination Council shall develop uniform guidance and examination procedures for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION REPORT.

The Federal banking regulators shall issue an annual report to Congress containing—

(1) information and data on the availability of access to financial services for minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses; and

(2) any regulatory or legislative recommendations for expanding access to financial services for minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 9. GAO STUDY ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the barriers to marketplace entry, including in the licensing process, and the access to financial services for potential and existing minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress—

(1) containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) containing any regulatory or legislative recommendations for removing barriers to marketplace entry, including in the licensing process, and expanding access to financial services for potential and existing minority-owned and women-owned cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 10. GAO STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN REPORTS ON FINDING CERTAIN PERSONS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the effectiveness of reports on suspicious transactions filed pursuant to section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code, at finding individuals or organizations suspected or known to be engaged with transnational criminal organizations and whether any such engagement exists in a State, political subdivision, or Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over Indian country that allows the cultivation, production, manufacture, sale, transportation, display, dispensing, distribution, or purchase of cannabis. The study shall examine reports on suspicious transactions as follows:

(1) During the period of 2014 until the date of the enactment of this Act, reports relating to marijuana-related businesses.

(2) During the 1-year period after date of the enactment of this Act, reports relating to cannabis-related legitimate businesses.

SEC. 11. APPLICATION OF THIS ACT WITH RESPECT TO HEMP-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND HEMP-RELATED SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The provisions of this Act (other than sections 6 and 10) shall apply with respect to hemp-related legitimate businesses and hemp-related service providers in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CBD.**—The term “CBD” means cannabidiol.

(2) **HEMP.**—The term “hemp” has the meaning given that term under section 297A

of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1639o).

(3) **HEMP-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.**—The term “hemp-related legitimate business” means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that—

(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) in conformity with the Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-334) and the regulations issued to implement such Act by the Department of Agriculture, where applicable, and the law of a State or political subdivision thereof or Indian Tribe; and

(B) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products, including cultivating, producing, extracting, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products.

(4) **HEMP-RELATED SERVICE PROVIDER.**—The term “hemp-related service provider”—

(A) means a business, organization, or other person that—

(i) sells goods or services to a hemp-related legitimate business; or

(ii) provides any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any other ancillary service, relating to hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, or other hemp-derived cannabinoid products; and

(B) does not include a business, organization, or other person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, or other hemp-derived cannabinoid products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing hemp, hemp-derived CBD products, and other hemp-derived cannabinoid products.

SEC. 12. BANKING SERVICES FOR HEMP-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND HEMP-RELATED SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-334) legalized hemp by removing it from the definition of “marihuana” under the Controlled Substances Act;

(2) despite the legalization of hemp, some hemp businesses (including producers, manufacturers, and retailers) continue to have difficulty gaining access to banking products and services; and

(3) businesses involved in the sale of hemp-derived CBD products are particularly affected, due to confusion about the legal status of such products.

(b) **FEDERAL BANKING REGULATORS’ HEMP BANKING GUIDANCE.**—Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal banking regulators shall update their existing guidance, as applicable, regarding the provision of financial services to hemp-related legitimate businesses and hemp-related service providers to address—

(1) compliance with financial institutions’ existing obligations under Federal laws and implementing regulations determined relevant by the Federal banking regulators, including subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, and its implementing regulation in conformity with this Act and the Department of Agriculture’s rules regulating domestic hemp production (7 C.F.R. 990); and

(2) best practices for financial institutions to follow when providing financial services, including processing payments, to hemp-related legitimate businesses and hemp-related service providers.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” —

(A) has the meaning given that term under section 5312(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(B) includes a bank holding company, as defined under section 2(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841(a)).

(2) HEMP TERMS.—The terms “CBD”, “hemp”, “hemp-related legitimate business”, and “hemp-related service provider” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 11.

SEC. 13. REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.

(a) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or group of customer accounts or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer or group of customers unless—

(A) the agency has a valid reason for such request or order; and

(B) such reason is not based solely on reputation risk.

(2) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency believes a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity which—

(A) poses a threat to national security;

(B) is involved in terrorist financing;

(C) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list;

(D) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country specified in subparagraph (C); or

(E) does business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has used due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D),

such belief shall satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the agency shall—

(A) provide such request or order to the institution in writing; and

(B) accompany such request or order with a written justification for why such termination is needed, including any specific laws or regulations the agency believes are being violated by the customer or group of customers, if any.

(2) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification described under paragraph (1)(B) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution.

(c) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided under paragraph (2) or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination described under subsection (b).

(2) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(A) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts based on a belief that the customer or customers pose a threat to national security, or are otherwise described under subsection (a)(2), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under paragraph (1) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall issue an annual report to the Congress stating—

(1) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered a depository institution to terminate during the previous year; and

(2) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making such requests and orders and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution” means—

(A) a depository institution, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union.

SEC. 14. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BUSINESS OF INSURANCE.—The term “business of insurance” has the meaning given such term in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(2) CANNABIS.—The term “cannabis” has the meaning given the term “marihuana” in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(3) CANNABIS PRODUCT.—The term “cannabis product” means any article which contains cannabis, including an article which is a concentrate, an edible, a tincture, a cannabis-infused product, or a topical.

(4) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term “cannabis-related legitimate business” means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that—

(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) pursuant to a law established by a State or a political subdivision of a State, as determined by such State or political subdivision; and

(B) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.

(5) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution” means—

(A) a depository institution as defined in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(B) a Federal credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752); or

(C) a State credit union as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(6) FEDERAL BANKING REGULATOR.—The term “Federal banking regulator” means each of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Office of Foreign Asset Control, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Credit Union Administration, the Department of the Treasury, or any Federal agency or department that regulates banking or financial services, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) FINANCIAL SERVICE.—The term “financial service” —

(A) means a financial product or service, as defined in section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5481), regardless if the customer receiving the product or service is a consumer or commercial entity;

(B) means a financial product or service, or any combination of products and services, permitted to be provided by—

(i) a national bank or a financial subsidiary pursuant to the authority provided under—

(I) the provision designated “Seventh” of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 24); or

(II) section 5136A of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 24a); and

(ii) a Federal credit union, pursuant to the authority provided under the Federal Credit Union Act;

(C) includes the business of insurance;

(D) includes, whether performed directly or indirectly, the authorizing, processing, clearing, settling, billing, transferring for deposit, transmitting, delivering, instructing to be delivered, reconciling, collecting, or otherwise effectuating or facilitating of payments or funds, where such payments or funds are made or transferred by any means, including by the use of credit cards, debit cards, other payment cards, or other access devices, accounts, original or substitute checks, or electronic funds transfers;

(E) includes acting as a money transmitting business which directly or indirectly makes use of a depository institution in connection with effectuating or facilitating a payment for a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider in compliance with section 5330 of title 31, United States Code, and any applicable State law; and

(F) includes acting as an armored car service for processing and depositing with a depository institution or a Federal reserve bank with respect to any monetary instruments (as defined under section 1956(c)(5) of title 18, United States Code.

(8) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term “Indian country” has the meaning given that term in section 1151 of title 18.

(9) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(10) INSURER.—The term “insurer” has the meaning given that term under section 313(r) of title 31, United States Code.

(11) MANUFACTURER.—The term “manufacturer” means a person who manufactures, compounds, converts, processes, prepares, or packages cannabis or cannabis products.

(12) PRODUCER.—The term “producer” means a person who plants, cultivates, harvests, or in any way facilitates the natural growth of cannabis.

(13) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term “service provider”—

(A) means a business, organization, or other person that—

(i) sells goods or services to a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

(ii) provides any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any other ancillary service, relating to cannabis; and

(B) does not include a business, organization, or other person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.

(14) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 15. DISCRETIONARY SURPLUS FUNDS.

Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by reducing the dollar figure by \$6,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud we are here today to pass this bill about public safety, accountability, and respecting States' rights. Forty-seven States, four U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia have spoken and legalized some form of recreational or medical cannabis, including CBD products. 318 million people live in those 47 States. That is 97.7 percent of the population of America.

However, because cannabis remains illegal under Federal law, the Controlled Substance Act, businesses in these States are forced to deal in cash; and the businesses, their employees, and ancillary businesses can't access the banking system.

The fact is that the people in States and localities across the country are voting to approve some level of cannabis use, and we need these cannabis businesses and employees to have access to checking accounts, payroll accounts, lines of credit, credit cards, and more. This will improve transparency and accountability and help law enforcement root out illegal transactions to prevent tax evasion, money laundering, and other white-collar crime.

Most importantly, this will reduce the risk of violent crime in our communities. These businesses and their employees become targets for crime, robbery, assault, and more by dealing in all cash, and this puts the employees and the store owners at risk.

Over the last year in Oregon alone, a string of more than 100 robberies and burglaries at cannabis businesses culminated in a murder when Michael Arthur, a dispensary employee, was shot to death during a robbery.

Just last week in Colorado, an innocent bystander was shot during an attempted break-in at a medical cannabis business. And in Colorado, we are always reminded of Travis Mason, the young father and Marine Corps vet, who was murdered while working as a security guard for a cannabis business.

We must do better for these employees, their families, and all our communities.

The SAFE Banking Act will create a safe harbor for financial institutions and their employees who choose to do business with a cannabis company. Section 3 of the bill is particularly important to not only cannabis businesses, but everyone who might do business with a cannabis-related company. This section would protect ancillary businesses, like real estate owners, accountants, electricians, and vendors, by clarifying the proceeds from legitimate cannabis businesses are not unlawful under Federal laws. This proceeds section is the key provision allowing all cannabis-related businesses and their service providers and landlords to access the banking system without fear of reprisal.

This bill now has 177 bipartisan cosponsors, and one-third of the Senate is cosponsoring the companion bill from Senators MERKLEY and DAINES.

Last Congress, the SAFE Banking Act passed the House 321–103, with the support of 91 Republicans. The broad base of support for this legislation generated a diverse group of cosponsors and endorsing organizations from banking, credit union, and insurance trade associations to labor unions, cannabis businesses and advocates, and State government leaders.

There are, obviously, many more marijuana issues we need to address working together, including additional research, tax issues, and criminal justice reforms. Passing this bill will show that Congress can work together in a bipartisan way to address outdated marijuana laws. I hope this bill is an icebreaker for the House to take up other reforms and finally remove the conflict between State and Federal laws.

In summary, even if you are opposed to the legalization of cannabis, you should support this bill. American voters have spoken and continue to speak, and the fact is that you can't put the genie back in the bottle. Prohibition is over. The SAFE Banking Act is focused solely on taking cash off the streets and making our communities safer,

and only Congress can take these steps to provide this certainty for businesses, employees, and financial institutions across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives VELÁZQUEZ, STIVERS, DAVIDSON, JOYCE, CORREA, and BLUMENAUER for their partnership on this bill and their commitment to making our communities safer. I also thank Representatives LUETKEMEYER, BARR, and PORTER for their contributions to the text of this bill and their support. Finally, I thank Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS for her support over the years and for continuing to make this a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on the SAFE Banking Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1996.

I want to begin by commending my colleague from Colorado, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for the way that he has approached this legislation. He is incorporating a lot of ideas from Members all across this Chamber and from across the country. He has doggedly pursued this legislation for many years, and I want to commend him for that.

I also want to thank my colleagues, Mr. STIVERS and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, for the way they have approached this bill. I think this is a testament to constructive criticism of a bill and it becoming better as a result of it.

Let me say, regardless of your position on this bill, I do think the fact remains that cannabis is a prohibited substance under schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act.

Let me further state that, by enacting this legislation, we are effectively kneecapping law enforcement in legalizing money laundering. These are concerns that I have, that still remain.

By effectively legalizing money laundering, we are inserting a new level of risk in our financial system. We are preventing our legal entities from doing their jobs. We are encouraging bad actors and placing our financial institutions at risk.

Rather than dealing with the issues of cannabis and the question of its Federal legalization, we are dealing with a component of the challenge, which is the banking of it, and it is a challenge. I think we are adding a new risk to our banking system and our anti-money laundering reforms that we passed just in January of this year. That seems counterintuitive to me.

For years, Congress has worked to reform our anti-money laundering laws. Now, in one fell swoop, we are undoing a lot of that hard work and we are going to make it easier for money launderers.

If you want to help the system, if you want to give financial institutions the certainty and security they want and need to do the job with the cannabis industry, where it is legalized in these

States, we should debate the merits of cannabis remaining a schedule I substance, not pass a bill that skirts around the substance of the issue.

This bill we are considering today is one of the biggest changes to U.S. drug policy, yet it was done with little debate this Congress. There has been a lot of debate overall in this Congress, far more than the Senate has even had, on the question of cannabis.

This bill, which is really the first step in legalizing cannabis at the Federal level, was reported out of the Financial Services Committee last Congress, and it is a committee that really has no jurisdiction over the Controlled Substances Act. We only had one hearing featuring one panel of witnesses. We haven't had a hearing this Congress to discuss changes over the last 2 years, let alone a markup to discuss any changes that might strengthen or impact the bill.

For example, late last year, Congress passed a sweeping bipartisan anti-money laundering piece of legislation. These reforms include prohibitions on the concealment of sources of assets in monetary transactions; a prohibition, I will add, that comes with a steep penalty of up to 10 years in prison and up to \$1 million in fines.

If we were doing our due diligence, we would have done a deeper discussion on how these new AML Act changes would impact banks working with cannabis industries as clients instead of me raising this issue at the eleventh hour on the floor, which is what I have got to resort to.

In addition to this concern, I believe I have voiced many other concerns, including our need to better comprehend and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1596.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Ranking Member LUETKEMEYER of the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions and myself as ranking member of the full Committee on Financial Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GREGORY W. MEEKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection
and Financial Institutions, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS AND CHAIRMAN MEEKS: We write today to seek your agreement to delay consideration of H.R. 1595, the SAFE Act, currently scheduled to be marked up on March 26, 2019, until the Committee has a better understanding of the full range of consequences that enacting such legislation may trigger. As you know, marijuana is a schedule I controlled substance as defined in 21 U.S.C. §802. The impact that many state laws, which have legalized marijuana, have on the federal laws governing the manufacturing, use, and sale of marijuana, including proceeds, raise many questions and concerns. Any change to these statutes, or

those that impact them, has the potential to divide the Congress and the country. We must ensure that Congress has done its due diligence, including conducting thorough oversight and review, before moving such legislation.

The hearing at the Committee on Financial Services on February 13, 2019, made clear that we need to better comprehend and address the supervisory and regulatory issues that would result from enactment of H.R. 1595. Many outstanding questions remain, which include but are not limited to the following:

1. What changes to our banking laws are necessary to implement the SAFE Banking Act or other legislation creating a safe harbor for cannabis-related businesses?

2. How would individual agencies enforce Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) requirements following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of BSA requirements?

3. How would individual agencies enforce anti-money laundering (AML) regulations following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? Would AML reforms be necessary?

4. How would individual agencies enforce Know Your Customer (KYC) rules following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of KYC rules?

5. How would individual agencies enforce Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) filing requirements and guidelines following passage of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of SAR filing requirements and guidelines to ensure illicit financial activities were not being financed?

6. How would individual agencies enforce Currency Transaction Report (CTR) filing requirements and guidelines following enactment of the SAFE Banking Act? What changes would be required of CTR filing requirements and guidelines?

7. In what ways are agencies working with state counterparts, including state banking and securities supervisors, under the existing regime? How would those cooperative relationships change with enactment of H.R. 1595?

8. Would H.R. 1595 require conforming changes to any of the statutes, rules, and requirements previously listed to ensure there are no unintended consequences, such as cartels and other bad actors gaining access to our financial system?

9. Would the safe harbor require any changes to the rules or processes governing federal deposit insurance systems?

10. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on nonbank financial firms, including insurers and investment companies?

11. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on third parties, including payment processors?

12. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on individual and institutional investors of cannabis-related businesses?

13. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on federal, state, and local law enforcement, including the Department of Justice and the Drug Enforcement Agency?

14. How are the proceeds from state licensed growers and distributors taxed under federal law? Relatedly, what conforming changes to our tax code are necessary?

15. What are the implications of H.R. 1595 on other products and services offered by financial institutions, including but not limited to mortgage products, deposit advance products or general commercial lending?

As Members of Congress, and the Committee of primary jurisdiction, we owe it to our constituents and to the public to fully

understand the implications of any legislation before supporting or opposing it. We urge you to hold H.R. 1595 and any related legislation until we have a full understanding of the consequences of this bill.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY
Ranking Member.
BLAINE LUETKEMEYER,
Ranking Member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, this letter raises a number of concerns, including:

What changes to our banking laws are necessary to implement the SAFE Banking Act, a number of questions that I have;

What agencies are going to be necessary for this working group to actually ensure that the letter of this law is adhered to by the executive branch, that they actually follow it as the writer of the legislation intends;

How the executive branch will interpret the "know your customer" rules enacted in the SAFE Banking Act, compared to what we enacted just 2 months ago, 3 months ago;

How we would deal with suspicious activity reporting requirements under the new guidelines of the SAFE Banking Act, compared to what we enacted at the end of last year;

How we deal with currency transaction reports under this law, compared to what we just passed; and

What are the implications on nonbank financial firms as well, such as insurers and investment companies.

Mr. Speaker, I think the author of the bill intends for insurers and investment companies and banks to have the same qualifications when they are handling money that has touched the cannabis industry. I think that is the intent.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to understand whether or not the administration would follow that intent that the author has stated clearly in debates here on the House floor last Congress and this Congress and, furthermore, whether or not Federal, State, and local law enforcement will have a similar interpretation that the writer of this bill says is his intent, that Federal law enforcement should hear the voice of Congress and hear this step to legalization which is part of this bill.

I do not think it is the author of the bill's idea to get into sort of the broader conversation about legalization at the State level and what we should do at the Federal level in this bill. However, that is a part of it.

In March of 2019, the National Sheriffs' Association voiced concern with this bill, saying that it could easily be exploited. They echoed my concerns that "allowing banking access for a Schedule 1 drug gives money laundering access to international drug cartels, which are already using the cover of legalization."

Mr. Speaker, I include that letter in the RECORD.

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
March 19, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, House of Representatives, Com-
mittee on Financial Services, Washington,
DC.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Ranking Member, House of Representatives,
Committee on Financial Services, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS AND RANKING
MEMBER MCHENRY: On behalf of the National
Sheriffs' Association (NSA) and more than
3,080 sheriffs nationwide, I write to express
our deep concern and opposition to H.R. 1595,
The SAFE Banking Act. This bill creates
protections for depository institutions that
provide financial services to cannabis-re-
lated businesses and service providers for
such businesses.

H.R. 1595 will increase the legalization of
marijuana across the Nation, which we un-
derstand is an intended consequence of this
bill. Furthermore, allowing banking access
for a Schedule 1 drug gives money laundering
access to international drug cartels, which
are already using the cover of legalization.
This will inevitably open the door to other
criminal activity!

NSA is concerned with the welfare and
safety of citizens and works to preserve their
rights to live and work in communities
where drug abuse is not accepted and they
are not subjected to the adverse effects of
drug abuse. The dangers of illegal drugs, in-
cluding marijuana, and the threat to public
safety caused by their use in terms of high-
way safety, criminal activity, and domestic
violence are well-documented.

NSA believes that any legislation regard-
ing national legalization must engage the
nation's law enforcement agencies in order
to have a comprehensive discussion regard-
ing the potential implications this bill could
have on our communities. We urge The
House of Representatives to defeat this dan-
gerous bill.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN F. THOMPSON,
Executive Director and CEO.

Mr. MCHEHENRY. Furthermore, we see
cannabis-legal States like California,
Washington, and Colorado, as the sub-
ject of recent news reports that cartels
have found that it is easier to grow and
process marijuana in legal States like
Colorado and ship it throughout the
United States than it is to bring it
from Mexico or Cuba. I include that ar-
ticle in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

[From Global Power, May 29, 2018]

FOREIGN CARTELS EMBRACE HOME-GROWN MARIJUANA IN POT-LEGAL STATES

(By Dennis Romero, Gabe Gutierrez, Andrew
Blankstein and Robert Powell)

LOS ANGELES.—General Jeff Sessions
called it "one of the largest residential for-
feiture actions in American history."

In early April, local and federal authorities
descended upon 74 marijuana grow houses in
the Sacramento area they say were under-
written by Chinese organized crime. They
filed court paperwork to seize the properties,
worth millions of dollars.

Federal officials allege that legal re-
creational marijuana states like California,
Colorado and Washington, where enforce-
ment of growing regulations is hit-or-miss,
have been providing cover for transnational
criminal organizations willing to invest big
money to buy or rent property to achieve
even bigger returns.

Chinese, Cuban and Mexican drug rings
have purchased or rented hundreds of homes
and use human trafficking to bring inexperi-

enced growers to the United States to tend
them, federal and local officials say.

The suspects are targeting states that have
already legalized marijuana "in an attempt
to shroud their operations in our legal en-
vironment here and then take the marijuana
outside of the state," said Mike Hartman,
executive director of the Colorado Depart-
ment of Revenue, which regulates and li-
censes the cannabis industry. Authorities
say they've seen an increase in these "home
grows" since the launch of recreational pot
sales in Colorado.

While California and Washington have
mainly seen organized criminals from China
buying homes and converting them into
grow houses, Colorado has largely been grap-
pling with Cuban and Mexican-led cartels,
said Sheriff Bill Elder of the El Paso County
Sheriffs Office in Colorado.

"They have found that it's easier to grow
and process marijuana in Colorado, ship it
throughout the United States, than it is to
bring it from Mexico or Cuba," Elder said.

A 'MASSIVE' MARIJUANA NETWORK

In El Paso County, NBC News witnessed
firsthand the damage a commercial-scale
cannabis grow can do to a home otherwise
built for an average American family. Grow-
ers pose as legitimate renters, and by the
time authorities disrupt their operation,
homes have been gutted and trashed.

"We've fallen through floors," U.S. Drug
Enforcement Agency Special Agent Randy
Ladd said. "The electrical damage, they
draw so much current that you'll see, in
some places, the wires are fused inside of the
electrical box. And—a lot of people—they
don't wanna pay the high electric bills. So
what they do is they take jackhammers and
pickaxes and they cut through the founda-
tion of the house, so that they could steal
the power."

One of the biggest busts so far came last
June, when the Colorado attorney general's
office announced that "a massive illegal
interstate marijuana distribution and cul-
tivation network stretching from Colorado
to Texas" had been dismantled. It was alleg-
edly Chinese-connected, Ladd said.

Authorities said the network was respon-
sible for securities fraud, millions of dollars
of laundered cash, 2,600 "illegally cul-
tivated" marijuana plants and 4,000 pounds
of harvested cannabis, according to the Colo-
rado attorney general's statement.

The operation took place in 18 warehouses
and storage units and 33 homes, mostly in
the Denver area, authorities said. "These
seizures are believed to only scratch the sur-
face," the office said.

Ladd alleged that some Chinese crews
cover immigrants' costs of traveling to
America in exchange for work in the grow
houses. "It's like indentured servitude," he
said. "It is a form of human trafficking."

The workers often fly from China to Bel-
gium, and from Belgium to Mexico, before
making asylum claims at the border and
then disappearing by the time they're sched-
uled to tell their stories in court, Ladd said.
Often when grow houses are raided, immigra-
tion fugitives are discovered, he said.

The grow homes are usually purchased by
shell property management companies, Ladd
said. "These growers can hide in plain
sight," he said.

HOW FOREIGN CARTELS OPERATE IN THE U.S.

The Sacramento-area raids, which also
struck Calaveras, Placer, San Joaquin, El
Dorado, Yuba and Amador counties, shed
some light on how many of the foreign rings
operate.

Northern California-based DEA Special
Agent Casey Rettig said suspects send cash
to the United States in \$9,999 increments,
just below the mandated reporting threshold,

and receive funds from China that fly under
that nation's \$50,000 foreign spending limit.
They then purchase homes with the help of
cash lenders instead of traditional mortgage
firms.

Last fall, a scenario fitting that pattern
unfolded in Grays Harbor County, Wash-
ington, southwest of Seattle, as a drug task
force busted an alleged cultivation ring fund-
ed by organized crime in China.

More than 40 suspects were arrested and
\$80 million worth of cannabis was seized, the
Grays Harbor County Sheriff's Office said.
"The majority of these homes were pur-
chased with cash, and information was devel-
oped that these purchases were conducted by
Chinese nationals involved in organized
crime," according to a statement from the
Sheriff's Office.

And just this month, search warrants were
served at 19 locations in the Puget Sound
area of Washington state, a federal official
who did not want her name used said. The
ring was allegedly run by three Chinese na-
tionals who produced thousands of pounds of
cannabis destined for greater New York, the
U.S. attorney's office in Seattle alleges.

The suspects, who face drug conspiracy
charges, purchased homes with the help of
multiple wire transfers from China that in-
cluded dollar figures—\$2,000 to \$5,900—they
believed would fly under the radar, according
to a federal complaint.

Ultimately it was the houses' exorbitant
electricity use—up to 38,477 kilowatt hours
in one day versus the American average of
just 30—that made them targets of a federal
investigation, according to the filing.

Even a single grow house can contain a
large marijuana operation. In April, police in
Pomona, California, an exurb in Los Angeles
County, announced they discovered a 23-
room grow house allegedly run by Chinese
nationals. Fifty-five-hundred marijuana
products, including 2,900 plants and nearly 21
pounds of cannabis, were seized, police said.

"The grow operation used advanced sys-
tems of lighting, air conditioning, fans, ex-
haust blowers and air-filtering systems to
control the climate inside the buildings and
the odor of marijuana," according to a Po-
mona police statement.

Pomona police spokeswoman Aly Mejia
said a gun and \$6,900 in cash were also found.

The DEA's Rettig, speaking from her base
in San Francisco, said the Chinese opera-
tions are "illegal under state law." In Cali-
fornia, marijuana growers, producers and re-
tailers need state and local licenses. Cities
can opt out and ban such businesses alto-
gether.

Rettig said even with the Golden State's
sky-high housing market—the median price
of a home is \$535,100, according listings site
Zillow—overseas criminals know that "mari-
juana can fetch three times as much out of
state."

"There's a great profit motive in it," the
DEA's Ladd said. "In Colorado, marijuana le-
galization has magnified the black market.
The standard price per pound here is \$2,000,
but they can get \$3,500 to \$4,500 by shipping
it back East. The profits are great there."

Mr. MCHEHENRY. Furthermore, be-
cause of this patchwork at the State
level, I think you are seeing additional
concerns at the southern border right
now, and I will include for the RECORD
a letter that the former Border Patrol
chief submitted that in February alone
there was nearly \$14 million a day of
marijuana caught at the southern bor-
der.

Despite these many issues I still have
with the SAFE Banking Act, I do ap-
preciate the work that my colleagues

have put into this legislative effort, but considering that the larger issue of cannabis legalization has not yet been debated here on the House floor, I think it is premature for the Financial Services Committee to do the full work of this Congress on the question of cannabis legalization at the Federal level. I think that would be better left to the Judiciary Committee, with a wider debate here on the House floor, and I would encourage that wider debate.

Notwithstanding that, I would like to thank my colleagues for the hard work that they have put into this legislation. Even if I have concerns, I know that there is more than sufficient support to pass this under the suspension calendar, and that would not happen were it not for the good legislative work of my colleague and friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

I do believe that my colleague was quite intentional about the date that he wanted to actually have the vote here on the House floor. With that, for those of you who don't know, tomorrow is 4/20/21, 4/20 being the operative date.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his many compliments. I would just remind him, we are the Financial Services Committee. We have a certain amount of jurisdiction that deals with financial institutions and financial services, and that is what this bill is focused on, dealing with so much cash generated by this industry, whether we do anything or not, and to try to advance public safety in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chair of the Small Business Committee, who had a lot to do with writing the Small Business piece of this.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 1996, the SAFE Banking Act, and I rise in strong support.

I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for his extraordinary leadership on this legislation.

When the pandemic first hit and stay-at-home orders went into place, many small cannabis businesses were deemed essential. Yet, just as States recognized these businesses as critical, Federal law still fails to provide them the same access to key financial services, like banking and insurance.

H.R. 1996, the SAFE Banking Act, will address this problem, enabling them to grow and hire more workers. Failing to allow cannabis businesses to utilize financial products and services not only creates artificial barriers for these small businesses, it is also an issue of public safety, as these high-volume cash businesses are frequently the target of robberies and break-ins.

That is why the SAFE Banking Act is so important and why, as chair of the House Small Business Committee

and senior member of the Financial Services Committee, I am proud to stand by it since its first introduction.

I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER for his leadership. Let's pass this legislation once and for all.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), the subcommittee chair on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman PERLMUTTER for his hard work on this. I am an unlikely person to support this bill because I am opposed to recreational marijuana, but I came to this because a company that is just outside my district that sells nutrients now finds themselves in the situation where 25 percent of their profits come from selling to legal marijuana businesses, and they are being threatened, a Fortune 500 company, with losing their bank accounts.

We can't let that happen. We have got to make sure that we stand up for safety and stand up for common sense. That is what this bill does.

Three points about this bill. Number one, it encourages safety because money that is in a bank account can be frozen and can be tracked.

By the way, this bill also increases suspicious activity reports, so this idea about money laundering doesn't work because there are suspicious activity reports that are expanded under the bill, and you can freeze and track the money, which is really important. That is why a lot of folks in law enforcement like this bill.

The final thing is, this bill includes provisions to stop Operation Choke Point that Republicans couldn't even get passed when we had the presidency, the Senate, and the House, and we got that negotiated into this bill. It helps in a big way to make sure that there's not an Operation Choke Point in the future, so nobody can choke off legal businesses from their bank accounts and from access to the payments system. That is a big deal. I want to thank Congressman PERLMUTTER for allowing that.

Finally, before my time is up, I want to acknowledge Congressman WARREN DAVIDSON, who isn't going to be able to fly in in time for this. Congressman DAVIDSON has been working on this bill with me for almost 2 years with Congressman PERLMUTTER. WARREN DAVIDSON has done an amazing job. I just want to acknowledge his hard work, all his efforts. We wouldn't be here today but for Congressman WARREN DAVIDSON.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1996.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Mr. STIVERS for working with me so much over the last few years on this. I am going to miss him as he chooses to take another path in the near future. I just want to say on the floor, that he is a real credit to this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, the SAFE Banking Act can be summarized in three basic points. First of all, this measure does not legalize anything at the State level. Today, 47 States, four U.S. territories, and D.C., representing 98 percent of the U.S. population, have legalized cannabis in one form or another.

Second, this is essentially a States' rights issue. This measure essentially says that when a State legalizes cannabis, the Federal Government will respect that decision when it comes to banking.

Finally, this measure is essentially about helping our local police officers back home do their job safely and effectively. We already give our local police officers the impossible job of taking care of the homeless and the mentally ill, and now we are asking our police officers to protect the legalized cannabis industry, a cash business, from those criminals that would prey upon them. This just doesn't make sense.

Today, because of Federal law, the cannabis industry can only operate on a cash basis. They pay their Federal, State, and local taxes with cash. Let me repeat. Today, the cannabis industry pays their Federal taxes with cash. They pay their employees with cash. They pay their rent with cash, and they pay their bills with cash. This is no way to keep our streets safe.

Let's help our local police officers keep our communities safe. Let's get the cash out of the cannabis industry, and let's pass H.R. 1996.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the SAFE Banking Act.

Kentuckians have a deep interest in the production, cultivation, and sale of nonintoxicating industrial hemp and hemp-derived products, including CBD. In fact, Kentucky boasts a proud heritage and agricultural tradition in industrial hemp. Henry Clay, the great Speaker of the House who once represented the district that I now represent, was, in fact, an industrial hemp farmer.

More recently, the Commonwealth has seen a revival in the industrial hemp industry, resulting in much growth and job creation in this area. Much of the growth of the industry occurred as a result of the Industrial Hemp Research Pilot Program established under the 2014 farm bill and the 2018 farm bill, which took it a step further and fully legalized industrial hemp.

Despite these positive steps forward, hemp businesses still have trouble accessing certain financial services. Just today I spoke with a CBD retailer in my district who confirmed that while the situation has improved somewhat over the last few years, access to card

processing services is uneven and uncertain. This bill will provide additional clarity for banks, insurance companies, and card processors that they can, in fact, do business with legally operating hemp businesses. It would also direct our Federal financial regulators to update best practices for serving hemp and CBD businesses.

Since we last debated this bill, conditions have improved for hemp financing. In December 2019, financial regulators jointly issued guidance confirming that banks are free to provide banking services to the hemp industry, just as they are for any other agricultural commodity. Unfortunately, there is still work to do to ensure that these legal hemp businesses have full access to the financial system. There remains some ambiguity, specifically regarding payment processors' dealings with hemp businesses. This bill makes needed clarifications.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for working across the aisle on this bill. He and his team took great care to ensure that these changes were incorporated into the bill and made the needed clarifications. I thank him for his cooperation. This will have a meaningful impact on Kentucky farmers, small businesses, and a burgeoning industry in Kentucky and across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his work on this bill and his input on the card processing piece of the legislation.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). He has put the effort together across a whole range of cannabis issues. I thank him for his steadfast work on this subject.

□ 1645

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here with my friend, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and the bipartisan support that we are receiving from Mr. STIVERS. We are going to hear in a moment from the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), who has been a champion.

Sadly, I feel my good friend from North Carolina could have given his speech 25 years ago. The legalization train has left the station. This is a business in the United States that is approaching \$20 billion of revenue this year.

As has been pointed out, 97 percent of the American public has access to some form of legal cannabis. Medical cannabis, 4 million patients utilize it.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that has arrived, and it is being held captive of the past practice by pretending that the Federal Government can wish away the legalization of this subject. They can't. The flawed Federal policies create serious problems.

As Mr. PERLMUTTER pointed out, we have had over 100 robberies in my community, including a fatality. These

cash-only enterprises are sitting ducks for people who have nefarious aims. It is an invitation for money laundering now because of the vast amount of cash that is circulated.

It impacts so many legitimate businesses, real estate, insurance, attorneys, accountants, who get caught up. We already heard reference to what happened to Mr. STIVERS' constituent in Ohio, a business that provides gardening supplies, that risks losing their bank account.

It is time for us to address this inconsistency. It is time for us to pass, again, the SAFE Banking Act. And it is time for us to move forward with legalization on the Federal level with the MORE Act, which will resolve these inconsistencies.

Once and for all, give the American people what they want and what they repeatedly vote for across the country. Unleash this State legal business to realize its full potential for health, the economy, and a cry for racial justice.

I appreciate us being at this point for a critical first step along the torturous path to full legalization, which I am confident will happen this Congress and not a moment too soon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the tragic passing of Steve Fox, a pioneering advocate, strategist, a true leader in the marijuana cannabis legalization effort.

It is fitting today that we are passing the SAFE Banking Act. We wouldn't be where we are today without Steve and his amazing efforts. His life work, leadership, and strategic brilliance are unmatched.

Passing this critical legislation today would be a small part of a fitting memorial for a man whose efforts made it possible, indeed, imperative to solve this problem.

I first met Steve as we were strategizing on the Oregon legalization effort. Back in 2013, after the Colorado legalization campaign that he orchestrated had passed and before Oregon joined the ranks of legalization, he was already a legend. He pioneered so much of the groundwork for the legalization movement that exploded after the success of the Colorado campaign which owed so much to his strategic brilliance.

Steve was thoughtful, hardworking, and self-effacing. While this has become a national movement with many leaders now emerging, none compare with Steve. Few will fully understand his many contributions and importance. I for one will miss his genuine, quiet leadership.

As someone who's been working on this longer than anyone in American politics, I know we are all deeply, deeply indebted to Steve. We mourn his loss, extend our thoughts to his family and many friends.

This should be the year that we finish the pioneering work of his career. It would be a fitting capstone to a lifetime of cannabis leadership, activism, and progress.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would say that if we are going to have legalization of cannabis, let's have legalization of cannabis and do it in regular order in the House of Representatives, not have it come through the Financial Services Committee. I wanted to be clear, and I wanted to make sure my colleague heard that.

But I do commend my colleague, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for taking every bit of the jurisdiction that we currently have and using it smartly for the best outcome possible.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), my colleague and good friend.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 1996, the SAFE Banking Act of 2021, and I am proud to help lead this commonsense, overdue effort.

The vast majority of States, including my own, have enacted laws that, to varying degrees, permit their residents to use cannabis. However, the Federal Government has not only infringed on the inherent right of these States to implement those laws, but also stifled medical research, diverted law enforcement resources needed elsewhere, and hindered legitimate businesses, businesses that provide vital services to cancer patients, veterans, and those seeking opioid alternatives for pain management.

Because of the Federal interference in this arena, cannabis companies are not afforded the same access to financial services as every other legal business in our country.

With banks refusing to accept their money out of fear of Federal repercussions, these businesses are forced to operate in all cash. They pay their workers in cash, store cash in vaults on-site, and hire armored cars and trucks to transport cash to pay taxes.

As a former prosecutor, I can tell my colleagues that this is a serious public safety issue.

But it is not just cannabis companies that are paying the price for this antiquated policy. Small businesses that provide services to State-legal cannabis companies can also be targeted by the Federal Government, such as plumbers, electricians, and even soil and fertilizer businesses.

Regardless of where you stand on the legality of cannabis, I think we can all agree that it shouldn't be that hard to sell a bag of dirt.

At a time when small businesses are just beginning to recover from the economic destruction caused by COVID-19, the Federal Government should be supporting them, not standing in their way. Congress must provide financial certainty to these businesses and safety to their employees.

Many of my colleagues have shied away from this issue because they are under the impression that it doesn't impact their constituents. But as I have outlined here today, it most certainly does.

The American people across the majority of States, both red and blue, have voted to enact sensible cannabis reforms. I encourage all of my colleagues to respect the will of their constituents and the rights of their States and begin engaging in these reforms.

It is past time we address the antiquated cannabis policies and remove unnecessary red tape. I strongly urge

my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the SAFE Banking Act so we can take a step in that direction.

The Federal Government can no longer afford to fail on an issue that our States have taken the lead on.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee for yielding.

I rise in support of the SAFE Banking Act, which I am honored to introduce with my colleagues, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and others.

It seems the war on drugs is a lot like so many of the other forever wars that this Congress confronts, deeply unpopular in all parts of the country except Washington, D.C.

I commend the majority party for bringing this bill to the floor and allowing businesses that serve particularly medical marijuana patients the opportunity to access the U.S. financial system.

There is an important part of this legislation that bears note. With the SAFE Banking Act, we will have an unprecedented opportunity for research and collaboration, which did not exist previously and which doesn't exist now.

There are so many universities, medical centers, other research institutions that would like to partner with and work alongside marijuana businesses with the opportunity to improve health outcomes for patients and to bring relief to people who badly need it.

I would implore my colleagues in the majority party to reach out to President Biden as I did to President Trump. Ask him to take executive action to remove marijuana from the list of schedule I drugs so that we can accelerate marijuana reform for the benefit of our fellow Americans and those who are in need and in pain and are counting on it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD these endorsements for the SAFE Banking Act, including from the American Bankers Association, the American Council of Independent Laboratories, the American Council of Life Insurers, the American Financial Services Association, the American Land Title Association, the American Property Casualty Insurance Association, the American Trade Association for Cannabis and Hemp, the Arizona Dispensaries Association, the California Cannabis Industry Association, and the National Armored Car Association. It goes on forever. I am not going to list all of these. There are about 50 different endorsements.

H.R. 1996, THE SAFE BANKING ACT OF 2021— ENDORSEMENTS

American Bankers Association; American Council of Independent Laboratories; American Council of Life Insurers; American Financial Services Association; American Land Title Association; American Property Casualty Insurance Association; American Trade Association for Cannabis and Hemp; Arizona Dispensaries Association; California Cannabis Industry Association; California and Nevada Credit Union Leagues; Cannabis Business Association of Illinois; Colorado Bankers Association; Colorado Municipal League; Credit Union National Association; Council of Insurance Agents & Brokers; Electronic Transactions Association; Independent Community Bankers of America; Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America; Law Enforcement Action Partnership; Mountain West Credit Union Association; National Armored Car Association; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National Association of Professional Insurance Agents; National Association of Realtors.

National Cannabis Roundtable; National Cannabis Industry Association; National Medicinal Cannabis Coalition; National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws; Minority Cannabis Business Association; Policy Center for Public Health & Safety; Reinsurance Association of America; Rural County Representatives of California; The Real Estate Roundtable; United Food and Commercial Workers; U.S. Cannabis Council; U.S. Hemp Roundtable; Wholesale & Specialty Insurance Association; TerraAscend USA; NUG, Inc.; Cresco Labs; 4Front Ventures; Terrapin Care Station; Full Spectrum Omega, Inc.; National Association of State Treasurers; Four Attorneys General from Colorado, the District of Columbia, North Dakota, and Ohio; 21 Governors from California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, U.S. Virgin Islands, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin; 51 state and territory banking associations.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to repeat this from my earlier remarks. This bill represents one of the biggest changes to U.S. drug policy. If we want banks to provide services risk-free, then we should do it thoughtfully and address the legality of cannabis instead of this workaround. This bill represents a yeoman's task of a legal framework so that funds from cannabis in those legalized States can be legally banked.

But that is not a holistic approach to this issue, nor should it be the Financial Services Committee leading the debate, which we have had one hearing on in the last 3 years in this committee—actually, you could say probably one hearing in the last decade on the Financial Services Committee. Yet, we have this bill, which, frankly, on its face is a very well-balanced bill to fix a glaring problem that is happening across the country.

This bill will legalize the banking of a federally illegal product. I am sure the irony of this is not at all lost on the American public.

The drug cartels, frankly, are keen to this, and other bad actors are keen to this. They will attempt to take advan-

tage of this if it is not well-implemented, if it is not thoughtfully implemented, especially if those things are not the case.

No matter how we spin what is happening right now, we currently have a crisis at the southern border, and human trafficking is certainly a part of that; a desire to come to the United States is certainly a part of that; and the movement of illegal drugs into the United States is certainly a part of that. This doesn't help with that crisis at the southern border.

Again, we are the House Financial Services Committee. We are not the Homeland Security Committee, and we are not the Appropriations Committee, so we can't fix all things within our jurisdiction.

Let me close with this. I do not support this bill because it represents a workaround to a much bigger debate that we need to have in the United States, and that is whether or not cannabis should remain a schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act. This fact is the bigger issue that I think this Congress should wrestle with, and I would welcome it. In fact, I think we can have a much more nuanced debate here.

But I do want to close by thanking my colleagues for creating a very thoughtful product. This legislative text is much improved upon from where it was originally. I thank my colleague, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for leading that conversation and leading that set of negotiations.

It has taken years to produce this product. It is strong legislative text. It is a strong legal framework. Even though I have pointed out a number of its deficiencies and challenges, I do see on its face how this would resolve a huge problem in a large number of States.

I understand that, and I am inviting the larger discussion about cannabis, as well. I think we need to have that conversation.

But I do thank my colleague, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for his leadership there, and I thank my colleagues, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. JOYCE, on our side of the aisle for engaging in that, as well as Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. BARR who dealt with particular issues in their States and their jurisdictions, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," but I understand if they do vote "yes." I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. To his point that there is a broader discussion that has to take place, the purpose of this bill is a public safety purpose. Its purpose is to keep people from being killed, from being robbed, and from being assaulted. That is within the Financial Services Committee arena because, at this point, the cannabis industry and the people who serve it in one way or another have to deal in cash, which really creates the

potential for the robberies, for the murders, and for the assaults.

We have been able to gather a lot of support for this. I mentioned the bankers, the credit unions, the insurance industry, the cannabis industry, obviously, the real estate industry, the armored cars, and the minority cannabis industry. Law enforcement is supportive of this. We have the National Treasurers Association, 21 Governors, and attorneys general because they know this is a public safety matter and that we really need to address it.

We have been working on it for some time, as the gentleman from North Carolina mentioned, but we need to get this to the Senate. They need to take whatever action they want to take, but we have to make our communities and these businesses safer.

The SAFE Banking Act is about public safety. Our bill is narrowly tailored to get cash off the streets and improve public safety.

I thank my lead cosponsors on this bill, Representatives VELÁZQUEZ, STIVERS, and DAVIDSON, and all of my colleagues who have listened to me talk about the need to address this problem for the last 8 years.

□ 1700

I also thank the staff of the Committee on Financial Services, the staff from my lead cosponsors, and my own staff, who put so much time into this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on the SAFE Banking Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1996, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ELIMINATE BARRIERS TO INNOVATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1602) to direct the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission to jointly establish a digital asset working group, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. WORKING GROUP TO SUPPORT INNOVATION WITH RESPECT TO DIGITAL ASSETS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall jointly establish a working group (to be known as the “SEC and CFTC Working Group on Digital Assets”) to carry out the report required under subsection (c)(1).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Working Group shall be composed of members appointed in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—

(A) REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMISSIONS.—The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall each appoint an equal number of employees of each such Commission to serve as members of the Working Group.

(B) REPRESENTATIVES OF NONGOVERNMENTAL STAKEHOLDERS.—

(i) APPOINTMENT.—The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall each appoint an equal number of nongovernmental representatives to serve as members of the Working Group, except that such number of members may not be greater than or equal to the number of members appointed under subparagraph (A).

(ii) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—The members of the Working Group appointed under clause (i) shall include at least one representative from each of the following:

(I) Financial technology companies that provide products or services involving digital assets.

(II) Financial firms under the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

(III) Institutions or organizations engaged in academic research or advocacy relating to digital asset use.

(IV) Small businesses engaged in financial technology.

(V) Investor protection organizations.

(VI) Institutions and organizations that support investment in historically underserved businesses.

(C) NO COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP.—

(i) FEDERAL EMPLOYEE MEMBERS.—All members of the Working Group appointed under subparagraph (A) shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—All members of the Working Group appointed under subparagraph (B) shall serve without compensation.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Working Group shall submit to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the relevant committees a report that contains—

(A) an analysis of—

(i) the legal and regulatory framework and related developments in the United States relating to digital assets, including—

(I) the impact that lack of clarity in such framework has on primary and secondary markets in digital assets; and

(II) how the domestic legal and regulatory regimes relating to digital assets impact the competitive position of the United States; and

(ii) developments in other countries related to digital assets and identification of how these developments impact the competitive position of the United States; and

(B) recommendations—

(i) for the creation, maintenance, and improvement of primary and secondary markets in digital assets, including for improving the fairness, orderliness, integrity, efficiency, transparency, availability, and efficacy of such markets;

(ii) for standards concerning custody, private key management, cybersecurity, and business continuity relating to digital asset intermediaries; and

(iii) for best practices to—

(I) reduce fraud and manipulation of digital assets in cash, leveraged, and derivatives markets;

(II) improve investor protections for participants in such markets; and

(III) assist in compliance with anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism obligations under the Bank Secrecy Act.

(2) REPORT LIMITED TO SEC AND CFTC AUTHORITIES.—The analysis and recommendations provided under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) may only relate to the laws, regulations, and related matters that are under the primary jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

(d) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Working Group.

(e) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Working Group shall terminate on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, except that the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission may, jointly, extend the Working Group for a longer period, not to exceed one year.

(2) SECOND REPORT IN THE CASE OF EXTENSION.—In the case of an extension of the Working Group under paragraph (1), the Working Group shall, not later than the last day of such extension, submit to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the relevant committees a report that contains an update to the analysis and recommendations required under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(1).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BANK SECRECY ACT.—The term “Bank Secrecy Act” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91-508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) HISTORICALLY-UNDERSERVED BUSINESSES.—The term “historically-underserved businesses” means women-owned businesses, minority-owned businesses, and rural businesses.

(3) RELEVANT COMMITTEES.—The term “relevant committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(4) WORKING GROUP.—The term “Working Group” means the working group established under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1602, the Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act of 2021.

Digital assets are a fast-growing but poorly understood area of finance and technology, and I believe this bipartisan legislation will help Americans, small businesses, fintechs, and financial institutions using digital assets to better understand the legal and regulatory landscape.

Last Congress, the Committee on Financial Services established the Task Force on Financial Technology, which was chaired by Congressman LYNCH, who is co-leading this bipartisan bill with Ranking Member MCHENRY. I thank both of them for their hard work on this legislation.

We must look carefully and diligently at how digital asset markets are used, as they present unique challenges to regular retail investors.

Cryptocurrencies, security tokens, and other digital assets, including those utilizing blockchain and distributed ledger technology, are new technologies. How we regulate investment in them will be one of the most important questions in the financial services space.

If digital assets are used by retail investors, we must ensure these products provide adequate protections, disclosures, and notifications to make sure ordinary investors are not defrauded or have their household finances ruined due to excessive volatility.

This is especially important during this unprecedented COVID-19 crisis, with many people struggling financially and possibly drawn to risky investments or scams.

This bill would require the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to establish a working group on digital assets. The working group will investigate the legal and regulatory framework and best practices related to digital assets. The working group will report to Congress on its findings to help this body and the public better address these evolving markets.

I thank Representative LYNCH and Representative MCHENRY for their thoughtful and bipartisan approach to this legislation, and I look forward to the work of the SEC and the CFTC on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act. This a bipartisan bill that addresses the much-needed collaboration between the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

What we have is a regulation of commodities through one entity of our Federal Government here in the United States and regulation of securities by another entity of our government. What we need is conversation between those two entities about the nature of digital assets and cryptocurrencies.

We have neither a security nor a commodity in what is a new creation of digital assets. Now what we see with the CFTC is that everything is a commodity in their worldview, and the Securities Exchange Commission thinks: Well, you are close. Everything is actually a security.

They each want to regulate something that is not in their nature to regulate or not in the substance of their capacity to regulate. We have neither fish nor fowl, neither security nor what the Commodity Futures Trading Commission wants to regulate in their world. So, you have neither fish nor fowl when it comes to this new creation of cryptocurrencies.

The fact is that the "Bitcoin Whitepaper," written by Satoshi Nakamoto, as they call themselves, is more than a decade old. What we have seen in that time period is the valuation of bitcoin, and then things that are like bitcoin that use an encrypted ledger system in the blockchain and tokenization to open up the value of that new creation of a blockchain, that new creation of cryptocurrencies is now valued over \$2 trillion globally.

Most of that innovation has happened outside of the United States because we don't have a legal and regulatory framework that is permissive of the raising of capital in order to develop those technologies. So, people in the United States, American citizens, are missing out on innovation and the potential economic upside of those innovations.

I would say this is one of the few pieces of technology in the last 100 years that Americans have not been the drivers of. In fact, we are reacting a lot to what is happening globally.

I thank my colleague, Mr. LYNCH, for his thoughtful engagement on this bill and his important structural changes to make sure this can be a bipartisan bill. Those conversations really are that balance between economic opportunity and growth that a lot of us on the Republican side want to emphasize at all costs, frankly, and then the protection of our citizens that some on the left want to have at all costs.

Mr. Speaker, striking that balance is really necessary for us as legislators. Let's just be pragmatic and honest

about it. Mr. LYNCH has brought some nice changes to this bill that actually will enable it to be a bipartisan vote, I hope.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does, with our colleagues from the House Committee on Agriculture, is it requires the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to establish a working group focused on digital assets. This is the first step to opening the dialogue between our regulators and market participants and will move to much-needed clarity.

The fact is that this working group will produce a report within a year that includes an analysis of the domestic regulatory framework necessary for the development of cryptocurrencies and digital assets here in the United States. It is really important that we get our act together, that we be technology-permissive, that we ensure that it is legitimate money raised here, that our existing laws are adhered to, but that we adapt and change and don't allow the debate between the CFTC, which sees everything as fish, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, which sees everything as fowl.

When we look at this new entity, which is neither fish nor fowl, we have to have a small regulatory framework for that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act. It has been 12 years since the cryptocurrency bitcoin was first introduced. Since then, digital assets have proliferated around the world. By one estimate, there are more than 4,000 cryptocurrencies and other digital tokens in use today.

While we haven't yet encountered a large-scale crisis, the lack of clarity in cryptocurrency regulation has become a real barrier in developing a framework to optimize the potential benefits of this technology.

U.S. financial regulations historically have been developed in response to financial disasters. We had the creation of the FDIC, which followed over 1,000 bank failures during the Depression. Similarly, the development of the CFPB occurred after the 2008 financial crisis.

This bill, H.R. 1602, is an opportunity for Congress and our regulators to act proactively toward financial innovation rather than to address gaps in our regulatory framework after the fact. Digital assets have the potential to make transactions more efficient, improve the raising of capital for small businesses, and increase inclusion across our financial system. However, the rapid rise of this technology has

created some concerns and questions about consumer protection and about how to ensure that we gain the benefits of this innovation while mitigating potential risks.

This bill, H.R. 1602, will create critical collaboration between the SEC, the CFTC, and Congress on the topic of digital assets. It will bring our regulators, small businesses, fintech companies, and investor protection groups to the same table to discuss cybersecurity investor protections and the creation of inclusive and transparent markets. In short, our hope is that this bill will help get the regulatory framework of digital assets right before a crisis occurs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. MCHENRY, for working on this bill and also Chairwoman WATERS for her support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman will forgive me, but I listed a lot of people on the SAFE Banking Act that I want to thank. One person who I forgot, and I would be remiss, is Mr. Denny Heck, who is now Lieutenant Governor of Washington and who was also instrumental in putting that together.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I concur that our colleague, Mr. Heck, was instrumental in these debates. I miss his lively debates in committee markup, but, frankly, given the sick burns he has given me there, I think I am better off with him as Lieutenant Governor. But I concur with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act offered by my friend from North Carolina and the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. MCHENRY.

The CFTC and the SEC have a long history of collaboration in financial market regulation. The working group created through this legislation will continue to build on this good work.

Digital assets present unique new questions for regulators: How and where do these assets fit into the existing regulatory regime? What new standards are needed to continue to meet our bedrock principle of customer protection? Where do the CFTC and the SEC need to adjust their regulations to address the novel features and purposes of digital assets?

While both the CFTC and the SEC are hard at work applying their statutory responsibilities and regulations to these digital assets, the disruptive, novel nature of these new type of assets demand a more holistic examina-

tion. This working group, with its mix of CFTC, SEC, and nongovernmental members, will be well placed to examine these important questions.

The Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act is a step forward in providing clear rules of the road for the creation, exchange, custody, and use of the full sweep of these new assets.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. MCHENRY, and his staff for working with us at the House Committee on Agriculture on refinements to improve this legislation.

I cannot close, though, without singing the praises of the CFTC. The Commission has been focused on this explosion in new technology from the very beginning. The Commission created LabCFTC almost 4 years ago, and it remains the premier Federal fintech office.

They have proven themselves to be an agile regulator and adept at understanding new technologies and their implications. The Committee on Agriculture has welcomed these developments and sought to strengthen the CFTC's authorities and resources to meet the challenges in regulating these new financial products. The bill before us today complements these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with Mr. MCHENRY and Chairwoman WATERS on this and other legislation and oversight to build upon this work. I urge my colleagues to support financial innovation and vote "yes" on this important legislation.

□ 1715

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), a member of the House Agriculture Committee and a leader on agriculture issues.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Eliminate Barriers to Innovation Act. As the ranking member of the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee, I am looking forward to digging in on the many issues surrounding digital assets, particularly digital commodities.

Digitally native assets represent a new way for people to interact with each other and potentially organize productive activities. Whatever promise this innovative technology may hold, it will not be realized if it is subjected to outdated and unworkable regulations.

One of the great strengths our financial system in the U.S. has is that the rules are well-formed, longstanding, and fit for purpose. While we may argue about the details, the basic principles of the U.S. financial markets, and the rules which apply to legacy assets, are well understood.

Digital assets, on the other hand, present new challenges. While the prin-

ciples won't change, the rules that bring those principles into effect may have to change.

This working group will give the CFTC, the SEC, and the market participants a critical venue to examine those principles and bring needed clarity to the application of existing rules on digital asset transactions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. LYNCH, for his leadership on this important issue and the issues of financial technology.

Frankly, one of the healthier conversations we get to have on the Financial Services Committee is on the nature and the deployment of the technology. It is neither the pure conversation of less or more regulation. It is a completely different scope of what we are doing in terms of laws that ensure that we have financial inclusion and allow offers for products to be cheaper, more affordable, and more widely distributed across the country. So I think this is a healthy thing for us to have this conversation on the Financial Services Committee.

This bill today is an important working group between the CFTC and the Security and Exchange Commission. That conversation between these two agencies, I hope, will bring us a new permissive regulatory framework for digital assets here in the United States and allow for the wider deployment and development of cryptocurrencies and all the technologies that are underlying those cryptocurrencies, those huge opportunity sets for American consumers in the development of these new assets in this first generation, but also the wire deployment of these technologies, whether it is in driverless vehicles or in the nature of how we interact with each other in the financial markets.

There are huge opportunities around digital assets, and this is the first step in Congress having a smart regulatory framework here in the United States for digital assets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. LYNCH for their bipartisan work on this legislation directing the SEC and the CFTC to work together with all relevant stakeholders to study the use of digital assets.

The working group created by this legislation will, undoubtedly, benefit the American public on this important topic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this legislation by voting "yes" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1602.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

CONDEMNING CONTINUED VIOLATION OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF PEOPLE OF HONG KONG BY PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND GOVERNMENT OF HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 130) condemning the continued violation of rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong by the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Hong Kong special administrative region.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 130

Whereas despite international condemnation, the Government of the People's Republic of China ("PRC") continues to disregard its international legal obligations under the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong ("Joint Declaration"), in which the PRC committed that—

(1) Hong Kong would enjoy a high degree of autonomy;

(2) for at least 50 years the "social and economic systems in Hong Kong" would remain unchanged; and

(3) the personal rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong would be protected by law;

Whereas, as part of its continued efforts to undermine the established rights of the Hong Kong people, the PRC National People's Congress Standing Committee ("Standing Committee") passed and imposed upon Hong Kong oppressive and intentionally vague national security legislation on June 30, 2020, that grants Beijing sweeping powers to punish acts of "separating the country, subverting state power, and organizing terrorist activities";

Whereas the legislative process by which the Standing Committee imposed the national security law on Hong Kong bypassed Hong Kong's local government in a potential violation of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China ("Basic Law"), and involved unusual secrecy, as demonstrated by the fact that the legislation was only the second law since 2008 that the Standing Committee has passed without releasing a draft for public comment;

Whereas, on July 30, 2020, election officials of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Re-

gion (HKSAR) disqualified twelve pro-democracy candidates from participating in the September 6 Legislative Council elections, which were subsequently postponed for a year until September 5, 2021, by citing the public health risk of holding elections during the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas, on July 31, 2020, in an attempt to assert extraterritorial jurisdiction, the HKSAR Government announced indictments of and arrest warrants for six Hong Kong activists living overseas, including United States citizen Samuel Chu, for alleged violations of the national security law;

Whereas, on November 11, 2020, the HKSAR Government removed four lawmakers from office for allegedly violating the law after the Standing Committee passed additional legislation barring those who promoted or supported Hong Kong independence and refused to acknowledge PRC sovereignty over Hong Kong, or otherwise violates the national security law, from running for or serving in the Legislative Council;

Whereas, on December 2, 2020, pro-democracy activists Joshua Wong, Agnes Chow, and Ivan Lam were sentenced to prison for participating in 2019 protests;

Whereas ten of the twelve Hong Kong residents (also known as "the Hong Kong 12") who sought to flee by boat from Hong Kong to Taiwan on August 23, 2020, were taken to mainland China and sentenced on December 30, 2020, to prison terms ranging from seven months to three years for illegal border crossing;

Whereas, on December 31, 2020, Hong Kong's highest court revoked bail for Jimmy Lai Chee-Ying, a pro-democracy figure and publisher, who was charged on December 12 with colluding with foreign forces and endangering national security under the national security legislation;

Whereas, on January 4, 2021, the Departments of Justice in Henan and Sichuan province threatened to revoke the licenses of two lawyers hired to help the Hong Kong 12; and

Whereas, on January 5, 2021, the Hong Kong Police Force arrested more than fifty opposition figures, including pro-democracy officials, activists, and an American lawyer, for their involvement in an informal July 2020 primary to select candidates for the general election originally scheduled for September 2020, despite other political parties having held similar primaries without retribution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the actions taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China ("PRC") and the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR"), including the adoption and implementation of national security legislation for Hong Kong through irregular procedures, that violate the rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong that are guaranteed by the Joint Declaration and its implementing document, the Basic Law;

(2) reaffirms its support for the people of Hong Kong, who face grave threats to their rights and freedoms;

(3) calls on the governments of the PRC and HKSAR to—

(A) respect and uphold—

(i) commitments made to the international community and the people of Hong Kong under the Joint Declaration; and

(ii) the judicial independence of the Hong Kong legal system; and

(B) release pro-democracy activists and politicians arrested under the national security law; and

(4) encourages the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury to coordinate with allies and partners and

continue United States efforts to respond to developments in Hong Kong, including by—

(A) providing protection for Hong Kong residents who fear persecution;

(B) supporting those who may seek to file a case before the International Court of Justice to hold the Government of the PRC accountable for violating its binding legal commitments under the Joint Declaration;

(C) encouraging allies and partner countries to instruct, as appropriate, their respective representatives to the United Nations to use their voice, vote, and influence to press for the appointment of a United Nations special mandate holder to monitor and report on human rights developments in Hong Kong;

(D) ensuring the private sector, particularly United States companies with economic interests in Hong Kong, is aware of risks the national security legislation poses to the security of United States citizens and to the medium and long-term interest of United States businesses in Hong Kong;

(E) continuing to implement sanctions authorities, especially authorities recently enacted to address actions undermining the rights and freedoms of the Hong Kong people such as the Hong Kong Autonomy Act (Public Law 116-149) and the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-76), with respect to officials of the Chinese Communist Party, the Government of the PRC, or the Government of the HKSAR who are responsible for undermining such rights and freedoms; and

(F) coordinating with allies and partners to ensure that such implementation of sanctions is multilateral.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 130.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 130, Condemning Continued Violation of Rights and Freedoms of the People of Hong Kong by People's Republic of China and Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

I have introduced this resolution to demonstrate this body's already strong, bipartisan support for the people of Hong Kong.

The situation in Hong Kong has been alarming for several years now. We have witnessed the degradation of civil liberties and human rights as the PRC continues to disregard its international legal obligations under the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration.

For months, in 2019, the people of Hong Kong peacefully took to the streets in historic numbers to preserve their democracy and demand their rights and freedoms. Unfortunately,

these peaceful protesters were met with excessive force by the police and the further imposition of restrictions on expression and assembly. Thousands have been beaten, injured, and illegally detained in violation of due process.

Rather than listen to the demands of the majority of Hong Kongers, the Chinese Government blatantly bypassed Hong Kong's local government and imposed a sweeping national security law on Hong Kong and its people with very little accountability or transparency. The vague, overly broad measures this security law put in place are little more than a thinly veiled attempt to erode Hong Kong's autonomy and restrict the space for peaceful expression. It steals from the people of Hong Kong the ability to exercise the freedoms of speech and association and creates an environment of fear around the expression of any political sentiment.

It is no surprise that since the passage of this law, political censorship has spiked significantly and Hong Kong officials have become increasingly brazen in undermining democratic norms, such as disqualifying pro-democracy candidates from participating in the legislative council elections and removing democratically elected lawmakers from office.

Hong Kong authorities have also used the national security law to target and silence pro-democracy activists at home and abroad. They have even issued arrest warrants for activists living overseas, including a U.S. citizen, for alleged violations of national security law.

Hundreds of pro-democracy figures and activists have been arrested or sentenced to prison, including Joshua Wong, Agnes Chow, Ivan Lam, the "Hong Kong 12," and Jimmy Lai Chee-Ying, while others await a further crackdown. But the resolve of the people of Hong Kong has not wavered, and neither will the resolve of the people of the United States, our allies, and this body.

Mr. Speaker, see, democracy is the cornerstone of the work we do in the people's House. We must support the people of Hong Kong as they fight for the rights and freedoms promised to them under the Basic Law. With the passage of this resolution, the House reaffirms its continued support for the people of Hong Kong.

We stand by activists who continue to come forward in their cause for democracy and human rights at great risk to themselves, their families, and their future. But by passing this resolution, the House sends a strong, bipartisan message demanding that the Chinese and Hong Kong Governments respect the will of the people of Hong Kong.

We will continue to push for democracy and respect for human rights in Hong Kong. We will continue to demonstrate that we stand in solidarity with the pro-democracy figures and activists who have made tremendous sacrifices for their city and for their core human rights.

This is an important resolution, and I support it and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

□ 1730

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his very moving and profound statement on democracy and democratic freedoms in Hong Kong. I thank the chairman for his leadership for bringing this important legislation to the floor. I thank the ranking member, Mr. McCAUL, for his leadership, as well, on an ongoing basis on this important issue and for his courtesy for yielding back.

It is always an honor to be with CHRIS SMITH, we have been working on these issues together for 30 years—a very long time—to demonstrate the bipartisan nature of the support that we have for democratic freedoms in Hong Kong, in the House, and in the Senate, bicameral and bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, Friday was a sad day and a disturbing day for the people of Hong Kong and for all freedom-loving people as sentences were handed down to Martin Lee, a global champion of human rights, and to other pro-democracy leaders for engaging in peaceful protests.

This afternoon, 3 days after that distressing development, I had the privilege to speak with activists from the Hong Kong Democracy Council. It was an inspiration to hear how they and the people of Hong Kong are responding to China's crackdown with great courage; how the dream of real autonomy cannot be extinguished by injustice or intimidation.

In our conversation earlier today—and in all my communications with Hong Kongers—they asked that the United States Congress continue to speak out to support their aspirations for the freedoms that they were promised. We were there when they promised them.

Today, with this resolution, Congress is honoring that call. I thank Chairman MEEKS, Ranking Member McCAUL, again, Representatives BERA and MALINOWSKI, and the distinguished chair of the China Executive Commission, Mr. McGOVERN, for their work on this important legislation.

H. Res. 130 condemns the continued violation of rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong by the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

It states that Communist China continues to "disregard its international legal obligations under the joint declaration" which mandates, among other pledges, that "Hong Kong would

enjoy a high degree of autonomy" and "the personal rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong would be protected by law."

This resolution today makes clear that China has trampled on its promises, including its draconian so-called national security law used to target and round up peaceful protesters under the guise of terrorism; disqualification of pro-democracy candidates from participating in the September 6 legislative council elections; the indictments and arrests for six Hong Kong activists living overseas—as the distinguished chairman pointed out, including here in the United States—and the arrests and sentencing of dozens of pro-democracy activists, including, as was mentioned, Joshua Wong, Agnes Chow, and Ivan Lam—and opposition leaders, the Hong Kong 12, of this past December and January. Again, I mention Martin Lee.

The United States Congress has always supported Hong Kong on a bipartisan and bicameral basis, and we remain laser-focused on efforts to support Hong Kong's efforts to maintain and grow the rule of law and freedom of speech in their home, and we are determined to hold China accountable.

Our response must include further strengthening our work with international coalitions—this has to be multilateral—passing legislation in addition to this resolution, to support Hong Kong, building on the passage of the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act in 2019.

Our legislative response must also address the plight of the Uighurs and Tibetans and the violation of their rights in China; and we must continue to use our platform to speak out about Beijing's crackdown on the global stage and ensure that the voices that the Chinese Government are trying to silence are heard.

In response, our focus must be on human rights. As I always say, if we do not speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, then we lose all moral authority to speak out on human rights anywhere in the world.

That is what I have been stating and fighting for—as we have together—since 1991 when I went to Tiananmen Square and unfurled a black-and-white banner reading: To those who died for democracy.

Ever since, many of us have fought to ensure that human rights and trade are firmly linked, from sponsoring the U.S.-China Act in 1993 and in 1994 urging Congress to deny China most-favored nation status to goods made by the PLA in the prisons.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. Frank Wolf went there and saw the evidence of prison labor goods being sent to the U.S. and corporate America just ignoring the whole thing.

Then in 2000 we fought efforts to give China a blank check when it failed to comply with its market commitment under the WTO, and they still continue to do that.

We cannot allow economic interests to blind us to moral injustices committed by China.

On Friday in a speech to court, the storied Hong Kong attorney, Margaret Ng, quoted Sir Thomas More, the patron saint of the legal profession, who was tried for treason because he would not bend the law to the king's will. Margaret Ng ended her statement by paraphrasing his final, famous words:

I stand the law's good servant, but the people's first. For the law must serve the people, not the people the law.

With that, I support an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote for this resolution and for the Congress' continued bipartisan and bicameral work to support the people of Hong Kong in the face of Beijing's exploitation of and assault on the law. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I am so glad it is going to have bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I thank the chair and the ranking member of the committee for their leadership.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, let me thank the Speaker for coming down on the floor to give her personal remarks. I know she has a busy schedule, but this really honors and shows her commitment to human rights in Hong Kong and all around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join the chairman in leading this measure to condemn the egregious violations of Hong Kong's freedoms. The Chinese Communist Party's relentless oppression of the people of Hong Kong is not a Republican or Democratic issue. We are united as Americans in standing with Hong Kongers.

Hong Kong's pro-democracy movement has inspired people around the world to fight for liberty over tyranny. But in June of last year, the Chinese Communist Party used its sham legislature to enforce a dystopian national security law on Hong Kong. This law criminalizes basic civil liberties, it violated China's treaty commitments, it destroyed the "one country, two systems" model of autonomy, and it inserted the CCP's police state into Hong Kong to crush dissent.

Since it passed, the CCP has purged pro-democracy lawmakers from the government while arresting the CCP's political enemies.

Unfortunately, the CCP's human rights abuses in Hong Kong are far from over. Chairman MEEKS' resolution continues our bipartisan work to call out the CCP's abuses and to stand with the people of Hong Kong, and I urge my colleagues' support for this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations and has been a champion for human rights more than most people have been in this Congress maybe combined.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the ranking member, for his kind remarks. I thank him for his leadership on this resolution, as well. I thank Chairman MEEKS for his leadership on this. It is a bipartisan resolution, and it is very much needed right now. H. Res. 130 condemns the ongoing violation of human rights and the rule of law in Hong Kong perpetrated by the Chinese Communist Party under Xi Jinping and the Government of Hong Kong itself.

As the author of the House-passed, bipartisan Hong Kong Human Rights Act signed into law last Congress, which I first introduced in 2014 and again in 2015, 2017, and then for a final time in 2019, I want to just thank Speaker PELOSI for putting that legislation before this body and for her strong support.

The Speaker mentioned a moment ago how we have worked for well over 30 years on combating human rights abuses in China whether it be Tibet, the ongoing repression and now genocide against the Uighurs, and the crackdown on religious freedom which has now become nothing but pervasive persecution against people of all faiths as well as the Falun Gong. We have worked very, very closely together, and I believe going back to right after Tiananmen Square, that linkage of human rights with trade was the only way to effectuate systemic change. Regrettably, we have lost so far that linkage. But, again, now we are seeing manifestations, particularly in Hong Kong.

Could Taiwan be next? Consider all of the promises that were made—and there were solemn promises made by the dictatorship in Beijing—to respect human rights in Hong Kong. The basic law is now being violated with impunity.

Of course, there is the Sino-U.K. agreement that is being violated. This is an international treaty, and there is the Chinese dictatorship one by one arresting the best, the bravest, and the brightest of Hong Kong and putting them into prison for long prison sentences.

As the Speaker noted a moment ago, we just saw that Joshua Wong got an additional jail sentence on his already 13½-month jail sentence. We know that he is a great young man, and he represents the future of Hong Kong. He now is languishing in prison.

I met Martin Lee in Hong Kong in the early 1990s, and he suggested to me that someday he may find himself in prison. He said that it is worth it for human rights and for democracy. He is an absolutely brave and an absolutely principled lawyer, a former member of the Hong Kong Legislative Council. He too has been convicted under this crackdown on democracy promotion in Hong Kong.

So there are also many, many others. Jimmy Lai was one of five who were just sentenced last Friday. So this is happening in real time every single

day. Once you are arrested and put into prison, the bully boys of the Hong Kong police make sure that you suffer, and you suffer intensely.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, again, Chairman MEEKS for bringing this forward and, of course, my good friend, Mr. McCAUL.

Mr. MEEKS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER), who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 130, a resolution condemning the violations of the basic rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong. As part of the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration on Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China made a series of commitments: that Hong Kong would retain a high degree of autonomy; that its social and economic systems would remain unchanged until at least 2047; and that the personal rights and liberties of the people of Hong Kong would be protected by the law.

Yet we continue to see the PRC infringe on Hong Kong's sovereignty and its people's freedoms. It has been made abundantly clear that the People's Republic of China has no intention of keeping its promises.

Most recently, the PRC forced through the draconian but mundane-sounding Law of the People's Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. This law casts an authoritarian net over Hong Kong and has empowered a crackdown on vaguely worded political crimes like subversion and collusion with foreign powers. From day one, that law has been abused, with the people of Hong Kong arrested for such crimes as wearing stickers or T-shirts with disagreeable slogans.

The rapid erosion of Hong Kongers' rights and freedoms is absolutely unacceptable, and it is past time that the PRC and its puppet government that it installed in Hong Kong be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to send a clear message that we in the United States will not stand by as the rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong are stripped away.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers if the gentleman from Texas is ready to close.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, we no longer see American flags waving over thousands of peaceful protesters in the streets of Hong Kong. Displaying our symbol of liberty has become a criminal act punishable by life in prison. But even though the freedom-loving people of Hong Kong can no longer publicly ask for our support, we still hear these pleas. Congress hears them, the American people hear them, and it is now

more important than ever that we continue to stand with the people of Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MEEKS for bringing this resolution which I was proud to join as a lead cosponsor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the ranking member for making sure we make a unified, strong, bipartisan statement, and all of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee on both sides of the aisle because H. Res. 130 sends a strong and unequivocal message: The United States stands firmly in support of the people of Hong Kong and the rights, freedoms, and autonomy they are promised in the joint declaration and basic law.

This resolution signals that the House's support of the people of Hong Kong and their struggle for democracy shall not waiver and shall remain firm and resolute.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my colleagues will join Ranking Member McCAUL and myself in supporting this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 130.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

CYBER DIPLOMACY ACT OF 2021

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1251) to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. United States international cyberspace policy.
- Sec. 5. Department of state responsibilities.
- Sec. 6. International cyberspace executive arrangements.

Sec. 7. International strategy for cyberspace.

Sec. 8. Annual country reports on human rights practices.

Sec. 9. Gao report on cyber diplomacy.

Sec. 10. Sense of congress on cybersecurity sanctions against north korea and cybersecurity legislation in vietnam.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The stated goal of the United States International Strategy for Cyberspace, launched on May 16, 2011, is to “work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation . . . in which norms of responsible behavior guide states’ actions, sustain partnerships, and support the rule of law in cyberspace”.

(2) In its June 24, 2013, report, the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (referred to in this section as “GGE”), established by the United Nations General Assembly, concluded that “State sovereignty and the international norms and principles that flow from it apply to States’ conduct of [information and communications technology] ICT-related activities and to their jurisdiction over ICT infrastructure with their territory”.

(3) In January 2015, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan proposed a troubling international code of conduct for information security, which could be used as a pretext for restricting political dissent, and includes “curbing the dissemination of information that incites terrorism, separatism or extremism or that inflames hatred on ethnic, racial or religious grounds”.

(4) In its July 22, 2015, consensus report, GGE found that “norms of responsible State behavior can reduce risks to international peace, security and stability”.

(5) On September 25, 2015, the United States and China announced a commitment that neither country’s government “will conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors”.

(6) At the Antalya Summit on November 15 and 16, 2015, the Group of 20 Leaders’ communiqué—

(A) affirmed the applicability of international law to state behavior in cyberspace;

(B) called on states to refrain from cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property for commercial gain; and

(C) endorsed the view that all states should abide by norms of responsible behavior.

(7) The March 2016 Department of State International Cyberspace Policy Strategy noted that “the Department of State anticipates a continued increase and expansion of our cyber-focused diplomatic efforts for the foreseeable future”.

(8) On December 1, 2016, the Commission on Enhancing National Cybersecurity, which was established within the Department of Commerce by Executive Order 13718 (81 Fed. Reg. 7441), recommended that “the President should appoint an Ambassador for Cybersecurity to lead U.S. engagement with the international community on cybersecurity strategies, standards, and practices”.

(9) On April 11, 2017, the 2017 Group of 7 Declaration on Responsible States Behavior in Cyberspace—

(A) recognized “the urgent necessity of increased international cooperation to promote security and stability in cyberspace”;

(B) expressed commitment to “promoting a strategic framework for conflict prevention, cooperation and stability in cyberspace, consisting of the recognition of the applicability of existing international law to State behavior in cyberspace, the promotion of voluntary, non-binding norms of responsible State behavior during peacetime, and the development and the implementation of practical cyber confidence building measures (CBMs) between States”; and

(C) reaffirmed that “the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online”.

(10) In testimony before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on May 11, 2017, Director of National Intelligence Daniel R. Coats identified six cyber threat actors, including—

(A) Russia, for “efforts to influence the 2016 U.S. election”;

(B) China, for “actively targeting the U.S. Government, its allies, and U.S. companies for cyber espionage”;

(C) Iran, for “leverag[ing] cyber espionage, propaganda, and attacks to support its security priorities, influence events and foreign perceptions, and counter threats”;

(D) North Korea, for “previously conduct[ing] cyber-attacks against U.S. commercial entities—specifically, Sony Pictures Entertainment in 2014”;

(E) terrorists, who “use the Internet to organize, recruit, spread propaganda, raise funds, collect intelligence, inspire action by followers, and coordinate operations”; and

(F) criminals, who “are also developing and using sophisticated cyber tools for a variety of purposes including theft, extortion, and facilitation of other criminal activities”.

(11) On May 11, 2017, President Donald J. Trump issued Executive Order 13800 (82 Fed. Reg. 22391), entitled “Strengthening the Cybersecurity of Federal Networks and Infrastructure”, which—

(A) designates the Secretary of State to lead an interagency effort to develop an engagement strategy for international cooperation in cybersecurity; and

(B) notes that “the United States is especially dependent on a globally secure and resilient internet and must work with allies and other partners toward maintaining . . . the policy of the executive branch to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, and secure internet that fosters efficiency, innovation, communication, and economic prosperity, while respecting privacy and guarding against disruption, fraud, and theft”.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY; ICT.—The terms “information and communications technology” and “ICT” include hardware, software, and other products or services primarily intended to fulfill or enable the function of information processing and communication by electronic means, including transmission and display, including via the Internet.

(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “Executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to work internationally to

promote an open, interoperable, reliable, unfettered, and secure Internet governed by the multi-stakeholder model, which—

(1) promotes human rights, democracy, and rule of law, including freedom of expression, innovation, communication, and economic prosperity; and

(2) respects privacy and guards against deception, fraud, and theft.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—In implementing the policy described in subsection (a), the President, in consultation with outside actors, including private sector companies, non-governmental organizations, security researchers, and other relevant stakeholders, in the conduct of bilateral and multilateral relations, shall pursue the following objectives:

(1) Clarifying the applicability of international laws and norms to the use of ICT.

(2) Reducing and limiting the risk of escalation and retaliation in cyberspace, damage to critical infrastructure, and other malicious cyber activity that impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure that provides services to the public.

(3) Cooperating with like-minded democratic countries that share common values and cyberspace policies with the United States, including respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, to advance such values and policies internationally.

(4) Encouraging the responsible development of new, innovative technologies and ICT products that strengthen a secure Internet architecture that is accessible to all.

(5) Securing and implementing commitments on responsible country behavior in cyberspace based upon accepted norms, including the following:

(A) Countries should not conduct, or knowingly support, cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors.

(B) Countries should take all appropriate and reasonable efforts to keep their territories clear of intentionally wrongful acts using ICTs in violation of international commitments.

(C) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support ICT activity that, contrary to international law, intentionally damages or otherwise impairs the use and operation of critical infrastructure providing services to the public, and should take appropriate measures to protect their critical infrastructure from ICT threats.

(D) Countries should not conduct or knowingly support malicious international activity that, contrary to international law, harms the information systems of authorized emergency response teams (also known as “computer emergency response teams” or “cybersecurity incident response teams”) of another country or authorize emergency response teams to engage in malicious international activity.

(E) Countries should respond to appropriate requests for assistance to mitigate malicious ICT activity emanating from their territory and aimed at the critical infrastructure of another country.

(F) Countries should not restrict cross-border data flows or require local storage or processing of data.

(G) Countries should protect the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on the Internet and commit to the principle that the human rights that people have offline should also be protected online.

(6) Advancing, encouraging, and supporting the development and adoption of internationally recognized technical standards and best practices.

SEC. 5. DEPARTMENT OF STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) **BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established, within the Department of State, a Bureau of International Cyberspace Policy (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Bureau’). The head of the Bureau shall have the rank and status of ambassador and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(2) **DUTIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of the Bureau shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, including implementing the policy of the United States described in section 4 of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021.

“(B) **DUTIES DESCRIBED.**—The principal duties and responsibilities of the head of the Bureau shall be—

“(i) to serve as the principal cyberspace policy official within the senior management of the Department of State and as the advisor to the Secretary of State for cyberspace issues;

“(ii) to lead the Department of State’s diplomatic cyberspace efforts, including efforts relating to international cybersecurity, Internet access, Internet freedom, digital economy, cybercrime, deterrence and international responses to cyber threats, and other issues that the Secretary assigns to the Bureau;

“(iii) to coordinate cyberspace policy and other relevant functions within the Department of State and with other components of the United States Government, including through the Cyberspace Policy Coordinating Committee described in paragraph (6), and by convening other coordinating meetings with appropriate officials from the Department and other components of the United States Government on a regular basis;

“(iv) to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, unfettered, and secure information and communications technology infrastructure globally;

“(v) to represent the Secretary of State in interagency efforts to develop and advance the policy described in section 4 of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021;

“(vi) to act as a liaison to civil society, the private sector, academia, and other public and private entities on relevant international cyberspace issues;

“(vii) to lead United States Government efforts to establish a global deterrence framework for malicious cyber activity;

“(viii) to develop and execute adversary-specific strategies to influence adversary decisionmaking through the imposition of costs and deterrence strategies, in coordination with other relevant Executive agencies;

“(ix) to advise the Secretary and coordinate with foreign governments on external responses to national security-level cyber incidents, including coordination on diplomatic response efforts to support allies threatened by malicious cyber activity, in conjunction with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other like-minded countries;

“(x) to promote the adoption of national processes and programs that enable threat detection, prevention, and response to malicious cyber activity emanating from the territory of a foreign country, including as such activity relates to the United States’ European allies, as appropriate;

“(xi) to promote the building of foreign capacity relating to cyberspace policy priorities;

“(xii) to promote the maintenance of an open and interoperable Internet governed by the multistakeholder model, instead of by centralized government control;

“(xiii) to promote an international regulatory environment for technology investments and the Internet that benefits United States economic and national security interests;

“(xiv) to promote cross-border flow of data and combat international initiatives seeking to impose unreasonable requirements on United States businesses;

“(xv) to promote international policies to protect the integrity of United States and international telecommunications infrastructure from foreign-based, cyber-enabled threats;

“(xvi) to lead engagement, in coordination with Executive agencies, with foreign governments on relevant international cyberspace and digital economy issues as described in the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021;

“(xvii) to promote international policies to secure radio frequency spectrum for United States businesses and national security needs;

“(xviii) to promote and protect the exercise of human rights, including freedom of speech and religion, through the Internet;

“(xix) to promote international initiatives to strengthen civilian and private sector resiliency to threats in cyberspace;

“(xx) to build capacity of United States diplomatic officials to engage on cyberspace issues;

“(xxi) to encourage the development and adoption by foreign countries of internationally recognized standards, policies, and best practices;

“(xxii) to consult, as appropriate, with other Executive agencies with related functions vested in such Executive agencies by law; and

“(xxiii) to conduct such other matters as the Secretary of State may assign.

“(3) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—The head of the Bureau should be an individual of demonstrated competency in the fields of—

“(A) cybersecurity and other relevant cyberspace issues; and

“(B) international diplomacy.

“(4) **ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT.**—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021, the head of the Bureau shall report to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs or to an official holding a higher position in the Department of State than the Under Secretary for Political Affairs. After the conclusion of such period, the head of the Bureau may report to a different Under Secretary or to an official holding a higher position than Under Secretary if, not less than 15 days prior to any change in such reporting structure, the Secretary of State consults with and provides to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the following:

“(A) A notification that the Secretary has, with respect to the reporting structure of the Bureau, consulted with and solicited feedback from—

“(i) other relevant Federal entities with a role in international aspects of cyber policy; and

“(ii) the elements of the Department of State with responsibility over aspects of cyber policy, including the elements reporting to—

“(I) the Under Secretary for Political Affairs;

“(II) the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights;

“(III) the Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment;

“(IV) the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Affairs; and

“(V) the Under Secretary for Management.

“(B) A description of the new reporting structure for the head of the Bureau, as well as a description of the data and evidence used to justify such new structure.

“(C) A plan describing how the new reporting structure will better enable the head of the Bureau to carry out the responsibilities specified in paragraph (2), including the security, economic, and human rights aspects of cyber diplomacy.

“(5) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to preclude the head of the Bureau from being designated as an Assistant Secretary, if such an Assistant Secretary position does not increase the number of Assistant Secretary positions at the Department above the number authorized under subsection (c)(1).

“(6) **COORDINATION.**—

“(A) **CYBERSPACE POLICY COORDINATING COMMITTEE.**—In conjunction with establishing the Bureau pursuant to this subsection, there is established a senior-level Cyberspace Policy Coordinating Committee to ensure that cyberspace issues receive broad senior level-attention and coordination across the Department of State and provide ongoing oversight of such issues. The Cyberspace Policy Coordinating Committee shall be chaired by the head of the Bureau or an official of the Department of State holding a higher position, and operate on an ongoing basis, meeting not less frequently than quarterly. Committee members shall include appropriate officials at the Assistant Secretary level or higher from—

“(i) the Under Secretariat for Political Affairs;

“(ii) the Under Secretariat for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights;

“(iii) the Under Secretariat for Economic Growth, Energy and the Environment;

“(iv) the Under Secretariat for Arms Control and International Security;

“(v) the Under Secretariat for Management; and

“(vi) other senior level Department participants, as appropriate.

“(B) **OTHER MEETINGS.**—The head of the Bureau shall convene other coordinating meetings with appropriate officials from the Department of State and other components of the United States Government to ensure regular coordination and collaboration on cross-cutting cyber policy issues.

“(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Bureau of International Cyberspace Policy established under section 1(g) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as added by subsection (a), should have a diverse workforce composed of qualified individuals, including such individuals from traditionally under-represented groups.

“(c) **UNITED NATIONS.**—The Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations should use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any measure that is inconsistent with the policy described in section 4.”

SEC. 6. INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President is encouraged to enter into executive arrangements with foreign governments that support the policy described in section 4.

(b) **TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Section 112b of title 1, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “International Relations” and inserting “Foreign Affairs”;

(2) in subsection (e)(2)(B), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) A bilateral or multilateral cyberspace agreement.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) With respect to any bilateral or multilateral cyberspace agreement under subsection (e)(2)(B)(iii) and the information required to be transmitted to Congress under subsection (a), or with respect to any arrangement that seeks to secure commitments on responsible country behavior in cyberspace consistent with section 4(b)(5) of the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021, the Secretary of State shall provide an explanation of such arrangement, including—

“(1) the purpose of such arrangement;

“(2) how such arrangement is consistent with the policy described in section 4 of such Act; and

“(3) how such arrangement will be implemented.”.

(c) **STATUS REPORT.**—During the 5-year period immediately following the transmittal to Congress of an agreement described in clause (iii) of section 112b(e)(2)(B) of title 1, United States Code, as added by subsection (b)(2), or until such agreement has been discontinued, if discontinued within 5 years, the President shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees if another country fails to adhere to significant commitments contained in such agreement; and

(2) describe the steps that the United States has taken or plans to take to ensure that all such commitments are fulfilled.

(d) **EXISTING EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding any executive bilateral or multilateral cyberspace arrangement in effect before the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(1) the arrangement announced between the United States and Japan on April 25, 2014;

(2) the arrangement announced between the United States and the United Kingdom on January 16, 2015;

(3) the arrangement announced between the United States and China on September 25, 2015;

(4) the arrangement announced between the United States and Korea on October 16, 2015;

(5) the arrangement announced between the United States and Australia on January 19, 2016;

(6) the arrangement announced between the United States and India on June 7, 2016;

(7) the arrangement announced between the United States and Argentina on April 27, 2017;

(8) the arrangement announced between the United States and Kenya on June 22, 2017;

(9) the arrangement announced between the United States and Israel on June 26, 2017;

(10) the arrangement announced between the United States and France on February 9, 2018;

(11) the arrangement announced between the United States and Brazil on May 14, 2018; and

(12) any other similar bilateral or multilateral arrangement announced before such date of enactment.

SEC. 7. INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY FOR CYBERSPACE.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, and in coordination with

the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall develop a strategy relating to United States engagement with foreign governments on international norms with respect to responsible state behavior in cyberspace.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of actions and activities undertaken to support the policy described in section 4.

(2) A plan of action to guide the diplomacy of the Department of State with regard to foreign countries, including—

(A) conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to—

(i) develop norms of responsible country behavior in cyberspace consistent with the objectives specified in section 4(b)(5); and

(ii) share best practices and advance proposals to strengthen civilian and private sector resiliency to threats and access to opportunities in cyberspace; and

(B) reviewing the status of existing efforts in relevant multilateral fora, as appropriate, to obtain commitments on international norms in cyberspace.

(3) A review of alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by foreign countries.

(4) A detailed description of new and evolving threats in cyberspace from foreign adversaries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors to—

(A) United States national security;

(B) Federal and private sector cyberspace infrastructure of the United States;

(C) intellectual property in the United States; and

(D) the privacy and security of citizens of the United States.

(5) A review of policy tools available to the President to deter and de-escalate tensions with foreign countries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors regarding threats in cyberspace, the degree to which such tools have been used, and whether such tools have been effective deterrents.

(6) A review of resources required to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior.

(7) A plan of action, developed in consultation with relevant Federal departments and agencies as the President may direct, to guide the diplomacy of the Department of State with regard to inclusion of cyber issues in mutual defense agreements.

(c) **FORM OF STRATEGY.**—

(1) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be available to the public in unclassified form, including through publication in the Federal Register.

(2) **CLASSIFIED ANNEX.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) may include a classified annex, consistent with United States national security interests, if the Secretary of State determines that such annex is appropriate.

(d) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the strategy, including any material contained in a classified annex.

(e) **UPDATES.**—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be updated—

(1) not later than 90 days after any material change to United States policy described in such strategy; and

(2) not later than one year after the inauguration of each new President.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) in section 116 (22 U.S.C. 2151n), by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h)(1) The report required under subsection (d) shall include an assessment of freedom of expression with respect to electronic information in each foreign country, which information shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country inappropriately attempt to filter, censor, or otherwise block or remove nonviolent expression of political or religious opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail, and a description of the means by which such authorities attempt to inappropriately block or remove such expression.

“(B) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have persecuted or otherwise punished, arbitrarily and without due process, an individual or group for the nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail.

“(C) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have sought, inappropriately and with malicious intent, to collect, request, obtain, or disclose without due process personally identifiable information of a person in connection with that person’s nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief, including expression that would be protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted at New York December 16, 1966, and entered into force March 23, 1976, as interpreted by the United States.

“(D) An assessment of the extent to which wire communications and electronic communications are monitored without due process and in contravention to United States policy with respect to the principles of privacy, human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

“(2) In compiling data and making assessments under paragraph (1), United States diplomatic personnel should consult with relevant entities, including human rights organizations, the private sector, the governments of like-minded countries, technology and Internet companies, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations or entities.

“(3) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘electronic communication’ has the meaning given the term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) the term ‘Internet’ has the meaning given the term in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e)(3));

“(C) the term ‘personally identifiable information’ means data in a form that identifies a particular person; and

“(D) the term ‘wire communication’ has the meaning given the term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.”; and

(2) in section 502B (22 U.S.C. 2304)—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (i) (relating to child marriage) as subsection (j); and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k)(1) The report required under subsection (b) shall include an assessment of freedom of expression with respect to electronic information in each foreign country, which information shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country inappropriately attempt to filter, censor, or otherwise block or remove nonviolent expression of political or religious opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail, and a description of the means by which such authorities attempt to inappropriately block or remove such expression.

“(B) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have persecuted or otherwise punished, arbitrarily and without due process, an individual or group for the nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief through the Internet, including electronic mail.

“(C) An assessment of the extent to which government authorities in the country have sought, inappropriately and with malicious intent, to collect, request, obtain, or disclose without due process personally identifiable information of a person in connection with that person’s nonviolent expression of political, religious, or ideological opinion or belief, including expression that would be protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted at New York December 16, 1966, and entered into force March 23, 1976, as interpreted by the United States.

“(D) An assessment of the extent to which wire communications and electronic communications are monitored without due process and in contravention to United States policy with respect to the principles of privacy, human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

“(2) In compiling data and making assessments under paragraph (1), United States diplomatic personnel should consult with relevant entities, including human rights organizations, the private sector, the governments of like-minded countries, technology and Internet companies, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations or entities.

“(3) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘electronic communication’ has the meaning given the term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) the term ‘Internet’ has the meaning given the term in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 231(e)(3));

“(C) the term ‘personally identifiable information’ means data in a form that identifies a particular person; and

“(D) the term ‘wire communication’ has the meaning given the term in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.”.

SEC. 9. GAO REPORT ON CYBER DIPLOMACY.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the extent to which United States diplomatic processes and other efforts with foreign countries, including through multilateral fora, bilateral engagements, and negotiated cyberspace agreements, advance the full range of United States interests in cyberspace, including the policy described in section 4;

(2) an assessment of the Department of State’s organizational structure and approach to managing its diplomatic efforts to advance the full range of United States interests in cyberspace, including a review of—

(A) the establishment of a Bureau in the Department of State to lead the Department’s international cyber mission;

(B) the current or proposed diplomatic mission, structure, staffing, funding, and activities of the Bureau;

(C) how the establishment of the Bureau has impacted or is likely to impact the structure and organization of the Department; and

(D) what challenges, if any, the Department has faced or will face in establishing such Bureau; and

(3) any other matters determined relevant by the Comptroller General.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBERSECURITY SANCTIONS AGAINST NORTH KOREA AND CYBERSECURITY LEGISLATION IN VIETNAM.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should designate all entities that knowingly engage in significant activities undermining cybersecurity through the use of computer networks or systems against foreign persons, governments, or other entities on behalf of the Government of North Korea, consistent with section 209(b) of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9229(b));

(2) the cybersecurity law approved by the National Assembly of Vietnam on June 12, 2018—

(A) may not be consistent with international trade standards; and

(B) may endanger the privacy of citizens of Vietnam; and

(3) the Government of Vietnam should work with the United States and other countries to ensure that such law meets all relevant international standards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 1251, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1251, the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2021, as amended, by my good friend and the Foreign Affairs Committee’s ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL. I thank him for his work on this important bill.

This Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee aims to prioritize efforts to reassert American leadership on a variety of issues. I can’t think of any issue that is more timely than ensuring American leadership is prepared to confront the growing national security challenge in cyberspace.

The U.S. is increasingly under attack online by foreign actors, whether it is the recent SolarWinds hack or other attempted cyber intrusions on critical American infrastructure.

Now more than ever, we need a senior cyber diplomat who can support American efforts to keep the internet open, interoperable, reliable, and secure.

To demonstrate how seriously the United States takes these issues, it is vital that we strengthen the State Department’s tools to address the challenges in cyberspace to American foreign policy. The State Department needs a bureau capable and focused on tackling the growing global challenges of cybersecurity, the digital economy, and internet freedom in order to be

better prepared to advance America's international interests on cyber policy.

Madam Speaker, that is exactly what this Cyber Diplomacy Act will do. Our allies and adversaries are prioritizing international engagement to set the standards and rules that govern how the internet is structured and used. The United States has always been a leader in this space, and now is the time to redouble our efforts to ensure we remain an influential voice in establishing the rules of the road.

It is critical that the United States prioritize our diplomatic efforts in this area and work with our partners and allies to establish agreed-upon norms. To keep the internet open and accessible, we must push back against countries that will exploit the internet to pilfer our intellectual property and hack into our country's most sensitive information, and which seek to derail international norms.

This bill is critical to supporting these key priorities. It authorizes the Bureau of International Cyberspace Policy to lead the State Department's cyber diplomatic efforts, including on issues relating to international cybersecurity, internet access and freedom, and international cyber threats, including countering terrorists' use of cyberspace.

This bill also directs the President to devise a strategy related to U.S. engagement with foreign governments on international norms with respect to responsible state behavior in cyberspace.

I am also pleased that in authorizing this office, we make clear bipartisan congressional intent that the Bureau of International Cyberspace Policy is comprised of a diverse workforce. Like the rest of our national security policy establishments, we know that ensuring a diverse and inclusive workforce improves the effectiveness of national security activities, and this bill makes that intent very clear.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support this critical and, again, bipartisan measure that will reassert American leadership on this important issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased the House is considering the Cyber Diplomacy Act that I reintroduced this Congress with Chairman MEEKS and a strong roster of bipartisan cosponsors. I also want to thank my good friend from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my co-chair on the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus. Over the past decade, he and I have worked very hard to advance critical cyber legislation like the law that set up the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency at the Department of Homeland Security.

With today's bill, we are taking the protection provided by CISA to the United States to the international stage and, as the chairman mentioned, providing rules of the road, which we do not have today.

The United States has strategic and economic interests in ensuring the internet remains open, reliable, and secure around the world. Unfortunately, not all governments agree.

For example, Russia and China are aggressively promoting their vision of "cyber sovereignty," which emphasizes state control over cyberspace and tramples individual freedoms. That is why the United States and our allies must be prepared to advance our own vision for cyberspace.

The Cyber Diplomacy Act gives the State Department the necessary tools to work with our allies and partners to stop the spread of misinformation, to stop the cyberattacks, and to stop the imposition of their so-called cyber security.

Madam Speaker, a new ambassador will be given the authority to establish critical cyber norms and standards that do not exist today to help define what is good behavior and what is bad.

Let me say that when the SolarWinds attack occurred, in the past, there were no consequences to bad behavior with the Russians or the Chinese, and I was very supportive and proud that President Biden struck back with sanctions against Russia for this bad behavior. That is what this office is really all about.

Without these clear guidelines, it is not possible to mount a strong response to our adversaries' destructive behavior. This bill is long overdue. To me, it is the last piece in terms of our cyber role in the Federal Government, now taking it to the international stage with our allies around the world.

Madam Speaker, again, I want to thank Chairman MEEKS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and all of the bipartisan cosponsors. The recent high-profile attacks remind us that what happens in cyberspace is vitally important to the United States and our allies and partners around the world. This act will enhance our ability to protect and promote our national security, our ability to compete, and the freedoms and ideals America represents to the world.

A decade ago, we had to determine what is the cyber role—or maybe even 15—what the role is of the Federal Government. We knew the Department of Defense and NSA had great offensive capabilities. We needed a civilian agency to work with the private sector to share threat information, and that became the beginning of the cybersecurity agency at the Department of Homeland Security. And, of course, the FBI investigates. But we have never had any international norms or standards or, as the chairman said, the rules of the road.

This bill, as I said, is long overdue. The Russians influenced our elections. There are, finally, sanctions against them. But before that, few consequences occurred. When the Chinese stole 23 million security clearances, including my own, there was zero response from the United States of America.

When these attacks occurred, and when our intellectual property has been stolen, so much so that Keith Alexander, the NSA Director, said it was the "greatest transfer of wealth in human history," with no consequence, we finally shut down the Chinese consulate in Houston because of the tremendous theft of intellectual property through the Texas Medical Center in my home State, including research and development on the vaccine. Then there was a Texas A&M professor being indicted for espionage for giving NASA data to the Chinese. This has to stop.

This act, this cyber diplomacy bill, will ensure that, at the international level, the United States is respected and that we are going to work with our allies to provide the norms and standards that are so desperately needed to better protect our interests and the interests of our allies.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1251, the Cyber Diplomacy Act, introduced by my friend and the ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL, is bipartisan legislation that is essential to America's national security and positioning our country to meet the current and future threats in cyberspace head-on.

This bill will give the State Department the tools it needs to further secure peace, stability, and economic prosperity for the United States in the cyber realm now and in the future.

Again, I hope all of my colleagues join both Mr. MCCAUL and myself in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1251, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

SUPPORTING PEOPLE OF BELARUS AND THEIR DEMOCRATIC ASPIRATIONS AND CONDEMNING ELECTION RIGGING AND SUBSEQUENT VIOLENT CRACKDOWNS ON PEACEFUL PROTESTERS

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 124) supporting the people of Belarus and their democratic aspirations and condemning the election rigging and subsequent violent

crackdowns on peaceful protesters by the illegitimate Lukashenka regime, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 124

Whereas the Republic of Belarus held a presidential election on August 9, 2020, that was neither free nor fair;

Whereas the presidential election took place without appropriate observation from local independent groups and international delegations;

Whereas since the presidential election, Belarusians have demonstrated their strong desire and commitment to a democratic future by organizing peaceful protests in Minsk and across the country;

Whereas Belarusian civil society, led by Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya, has called for the resignation of Alyaksandr Lukashenka, the peaceful transition of power, the organization of new, free, and fair elections and the release of all political prisoners;

Whereas Belarusian opposition leaders have faced intimidation, harassment, and detention, including direct threats leading to the forced exile of Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya in Lithuania as well as the kidnapping and imprisonment of Maria Kalesnikava and other opposition leaders;

Whereas in the months since the election, Belarusian authorities have arbitrarily detained and brutally assaulted tens of thousands of peaceful protesters, journalists, and opposition figures, of which hundreds remain in detention;

Whereas human rights groups have documented hundreds of horrific accounts of torture, including sexual violence and rape, along with other instances ill-treatment and excessive force used against detainees arrested for peaceful protest;

Whereas on August 13 and 14, 2020, relatives of detainees held in the infamous “Akrestsina” detention facility in Minsk recorded the sounds of “incessant beatings which were clearly audible in the street, and numerous voices screaming out in agony with some begging for mercy”;

Whereas thousands of Belarusians have fled to neighboring countries seeking political asylum;

Whereas independent journalists and the free media have faced intimidation, violence, mass arrests and prosecution, with many foreign journalists being stripped of their accreditation;

Whereas Katsyaryna Andreieva and Darya Chultsovatwo, two journalists who work for Belsat, an independent Polish-based satellite television station aimed at Belarus, have each been sentenced to two years in prison simply for reporting live from a rally in Minsk in November 2020;

Whereas Ihar Losik, a popular Belarusian blogger on Telegram, went on a hunger strike for 6 weeks to protest the politically-motivated charges that he helped organize riots after the fraudulent presidential election;

Whereas member states of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), of which the United States and Belarus are members, invoked paragraph 12 of the 1991 Moscow Document of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the OSCE (Moscow Mechanism) to establish a mission of experts to review allegations of human rights violations;

Whereas the OSCE Rapporteur’s Report under the Moscow Mechanism on Alleged Human Rights Violations related to the presidential elections of August 9, 2020, in

Belarus, published November 5, 2020, concluded that there was “overwhelming evidence that the presidential elections of 9 August 2020 [had] been falsified and that massive and systematic human rights violations [had] been committed by the Belarusian security forces in response to peaceful demonstrations and protests”;

Whereas women have played a leading role in peaceful demonstrations across the country, protesting the police brutality and mass detentions by wearing red and white, carrying flowers, and forming “solidarity chains”;

Whereas the information technology (IT) industry in Belarus has played a prominent role in the democratic movement by demanding an end to violent oppression, as well as creating safe platforms for demonstrators to communicate and track people who have been detained or went missing during mass detentions;

Whereas Belarusian authorities have continually disrupted internet channels in an attempt to limit communication among demonstrators and targeted lead technology companies and their employees advocating for democracy;

Whereas Belarusian state-owned television channels have encouraged violence against peaceful demonstrators;

Whereas a recent survey of IT specialists found that 15 percent of IT specialists working in Belarus have already relocated to neighboring countries, and over 40 percent of IT specialists no longer want to work in Belarus, resulting in a devastating loss of talent for Belarus, possibly permanently damaging the Belarusian technology industry along with the Belarusian economy;

Whereas hundreds of former law enforcement officers in Belarus who have defected in defiance of illegal orders to commit human rights violations and cover up crimes against civilians and those who have assisted law enforcement officers in defecting have faced harassment, financial penalties, arrest, detention, and other punitive measures;

Whereas several peaceful demonstrators have died as a result of police violence, including 31-year-old Roman Bondrenko who was violently beaten by plainclothes police officers and, as a result, suffered head injuries that resulted in his death;

Whereas Belarusian universities continue to expel students and dismiss educators and researchers for participating in peaceful protests;

Whereas child protective services have threatened multiple civic activists with termination of parental rights for bringing minor children to peaceful protests;

Whereas factory workers at state-owned enterprises have been continuously harassed for trying to organize independent trade unions and have been forced to sign political letters opposing sanctions by the European Union under threat of termination of their employment;

Whereas a transatlantic community of legislators has emerged in support of uplifting the democratic aspirations of the Belarusian people;

Whereas international advocacy, including by co-host Latvia, succeeded in preventing the illegitimate Government of Belarus from hosting the 2021 Ice Hockey World Championship;

Whereas the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Canada have enacted sanctions and other punitive measures against dozens of individuals and entities found responsible for the perpetration of violence against peaceful demonstrators, opposition members, and journalists, among others;

Whereas Alyaksandr Lukashenka continues to undermine the sovereignty and

independence of Belarus through efforts to integrate Belarus into a so-called “Union States” under the control of Russia;

Whereas the House of Representatives passed the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act of 2020 with unanimous consent, sending a clear message of overwhelming, bipartisan support for the democratic movement in Belarus;

Whereas the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act of 2020 was signed into law via the fiscal year 2021 omnibus spending bill, expanding the President’s authority to impose sanctions related to Belarus, including on Russian individuals who have undermined Belarus’ sovereignty, as well as authorizing increased assistance to counter internet censorship and surveillance technology, support women advocating for freedom and human rights, and support political refugees fleeing the crackdown in Belarus, among other things; and

Whereas the Belarusian opposition, led by Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya, organized a Day of Solidarity on February 7, 2020, where countries, cities, and political and elected leaders, as well as everyday citizens around the world demonstrated their support for the six months of historic peaceful protests since the fraudulent presidential election that took place on August 9, 2020: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) finds that the August 9, 2020, presidential election in Belarus was neither free nor fair and, therefore, does not recognize the government-announced results or Alyaksandr Lukashenka as the legitimate President of Belarus;

(2) calls for new free and fair elections under Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe observation;

(3) affirms that the people of Belarus have the right to determine the future of Belarus without unwelcome intervention from the Russian Federation or any outside actors in violation of Belarusian independence and sovereignty;

(4) condemns the human rights violations committed by Belarusian authorities, including against peaceful demonstrators, civil society activists, opposition leaders, students, educators, employees at state-owned enterprises, medical personnel, and journalists, and calls for such authorities to halt any further acts of violence against civilians;

(5) calls for the immediate release of all political prisoners and those unlawfully detained in connection with the peaceful demonstrations including independent journalists and family members of United States citizens;

(6) recognizes the sacrifices and bravery of the Belarusian people and the incredible organization by Belarusian women to peacefully demand a free and fair democratic process while enduring the state-sponsored violence that followed the August 9, 2020, election;

(7) calls on Alyaksandr Lukashenka and Belarusian authorities to engage in an open and constructive dialogue with the opposition members and other stakeholders to bring about a peaceful transition of power;

(8) calls for the protection of civil society actors and members of the opposition against arbitrary arrest and violence while conducting peaceful discussions relating to the peaceful transition of power in Belarus;

(9) recognizes the Coordination Council established by Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya as a legitimate institution to participate in a dialogue on a peaceful transition of power;

(10) urges continued cooperation among the United States and its transatlantic allies

and partners to explore avenues in support of the democratic movement in Belarus;

(11) calls for further targeted sanctions coordinated between the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, Canada, and other allies and partners against Belarusian authorities who committed human rights violations and engaged in activities that resulted in the falsification of the August 9, 2020, election results;

(12) encourages when considering, in coordination with transatlantic partners, the sanctioning of Belarusian state-owned companies that have directly violated the rights of their workers as a result of their participation in or in connection to the ongoing democratic movement in Belarus that the Administration take into consideration the potential implications of making these companies more vulnerable to takeovers by Russian or Chinese state-owned companies;

(13) calls on the transatlantic community to review and consider reassessing any financial assistance that supports the Lukashenka regime, including participation in state debt issuances or procurement contracts;

(14) supports increasing funds available for foreign assistance to Belarusian civil society groups as well as legal assistance for activists and independent journalists, among others, as called for in the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act of 2020;

(15) urges the President to provide the United States Agency for Global Media with a surge capacity (as such term is defined in section 316 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6216)) for programs and activities in Belarus, including to protect the brave independent journalists reporting from within Belarus as called for in the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act of 2020;

(16) calls for an international investigation into the human rights abuses committed during and after the August 9, 2020, presidential election; and

(17) continues to support the aspirations of the people of Belarus for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, and reaffirms that the fulfillment of such aspirations is critical to ensuring the continued strength of Belarusian sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 124.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 124.

This resolution, introduced by the chair of the Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment and Cyber, Mr. KEATING, my good friend, is an excellent measure that solidifies this body's already strong bipartisan support for the people of Belarus. I also

thank the ranking member for his work.

After Alyaksandr Lukashenka stole the August 9, 2020, elections, the Belarusian people, led by thousands of women dressed in white and fearless opposition leaders, including Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya, peacefully took to the streets in historic numbers to demand the right to chart their own democratic future, a future free of Lukashenka's dictatorial grip.

Tragically, but unsurprisingly, these peaceful protestors were met with the same brutal, violent tactics that have defined Lukashenka's nearly three-decades-long rule. In his desperate attempt to cling to power, thousands were beaten, injured, and illegally detained without due process by security forces. Meanwhile, critical access to the internet, international broadcasting, and other forms of communication and expression were cut off to suppress the dissent, control the flow of information, and prevent the opposition from organizing any further.

But the resolve of the Belarusian people, the brave, peaceful protestors, the opposition in exile, and the vibrant Belarusian diaspora has not wavered. The resolve of the United States, our allies, and this body must not waver either.

With the passing of this resolution, the House shines a spotlight on the illegitimacy of the Lukashenka regime and his abhorrent human rights violations.

We must continue to build on the work of the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act of 2020, an effort led by another distinguished member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and, as indicated by Ranking Member MCCAUL, a longtime champion for human rights in Belarus, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We thank him for his work.

By passing this good, bipartisan resolution, the House will strengthen its longstanding commitment and record on democracy and human rights. We will continue to demonstrate that we stand in solidarity with the freedom-loving Belarusians, who continue to struggle for their fundamental democratic and human rights every day. We do this hand in hand with our allies and partners across the Atlantic.

Madam Speaker, I stand today not only to support this measure, but in support of democracy and the sanctity of the democratic process and solidarity with the people of Belarus.

This is a very important resolution. I support it and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues today to express our support for the people of Belarus and their democratic aspirations.

There is no question that Alyaksandr Lukashenka rigged the presidential

election in Belarus this past August. He is an illegitimate leader who will never be recognized by the community of democratic nations. The scale of the electoral fraud was unprecedented, as was the violent crackdown by Lukashenka's cronies afterwards.

The reports of peaceful protestors being beaten, tortured, and arbitrarily detained and killed are appalling. In a cowardly attempt to conceal their heinous crimes, the regime has repressed independent media, disrupted internet access, and expelled and detained countless journalists.

Given this despicable human rights situation in Belarus, I commend the Biden administration's decision today to renew sanctions against nine Belarusian state-owned enterprises.

Despite the terror inflicted upon them, the Belarusian people have refused to relent. They continue to demand a free and fair vote. Their courage is truly inspiring.

This resolution reminds the corrupt Lukashenka regime that the United States Congress supports the people of Belarus. We echo their calls for the immediate release of more than 300 political prisoners and all of those unlawfully detained by the regime. We also join them in demanding new, free, and fair elections to be held in Belarus.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment and Cyber; an esteemed member of the Foreign Affairs Committee; and the author of this important bill.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my friend, GREGORY MEEKS of New York, for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

I also thank the ranking member, my friend and colleague, MICHAEL MCCAUL of Texas, for his support and leadership. I also thank the longtime leader of this cause, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for his support. I thank them both for their bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 124.

Today marks just over 8 months since an openly fraudulent presidential election took place in Belarus. In that time, Belarusians have made it clear by marching in the street en masse, with a pronounced leadership of brave women, that they want and need democracy in Belarus.

Despite the peaceful nature of these events, protestors have been beaten and arrested, and opposition leaders have either been forced out of the country, like Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya; or jailed, like Maria Kalesnikava.

This resolution, inspired by the courage of those taking to the streets to defend democracy, makes it clear to the people of Belarus and to the international community that the United

States House of Representatives has reviewed the facts and determined that the 2020 Belarus presidential election was neither free nor fair, and that Alyaksandr Lukashenka cannot and must not be recognized as Belarus's legitimate president.

The resolution also strongly condemns the heinous human rights violations that have been committed by Belarusian authorities and underlines that Belarus is a sovereign nation, whose people have the right to self-determination.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment and Cyber, I held a hearing in March, where we heard firsthand from presidential candidate Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya about the unprecedented violence and verbal, physical, emotional, and sexual assault of peaceful protestors. In their fight for democracy, the Belarusian people have endured unprecedented repression and many protestors have been left severely wounded, and at least eight have been murdered by this reprehensible regime.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is a vital signal of support for the democratic movement in Belarus, that their sacrifice will not be forgotten, and their calls for recognition will not go unanswered.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution and send a clear message that the United States is paying close attention to the human rights situation in Belarus and will continue to support the people of Belarus in their fight for a new, free, and fair election.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Global Human Rights; and also the author of the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act that was signed into law last year.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding and for his leadership, as well as Chairman MEEKS. I especially want to thank Chairman KEATING for authoring this very, very important resolution and for his hearing that he held in March on the situation in Belarus.

Madam Speaker, the resolution condemns Alyaksandr Lukashenka's ongoing and ever-worsening brutality and crackdown on peaceful protestors.

As my colleagues know, the leading opposition presidential candidate, Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya, who almost certainly won the election in August and helped form the Coordination Council as a means to seek a peaceful transition of power, needs our consistent and robust support and encouragement.

Today, Ms. Tsikhanouskaya is in exile in Lithuania, where she continues to rally the Belarusian people and the world and to demand democracy and human rights for her nation, no matter how long it takes.

More than 8 months have passed since the stolen August presidential election, and about 5 months since President Trump signed the Belarus Democracy, Human Rights, and Sovereignty Act of 2020, which I authored.

Let me point out to my colleagues that I first authored the Belarus Democracy Act in the year 2004. It was enacted into law and reauthorized in 2006 and 2011. What it did was focus on denying visas to human rights abusers and made people who are singled out ineligible for participating in our economy.

In retaliation, I was told I could not visit Belarus. I was denied a visa repeatedly. I finally got there twice and raised human rights issues with Lukashenka himself.

Let me just say that a resolution like this has real impact. Just last week, as a result of an outcry from human rights organizations, the government released Tatsiana Hatsura-Yavorska, the director of the Watch Docs Film Festival in Belarus, and they dropped the charges because of the outcry.

Again, I want to thank Mr. KEATING, the chairman, for doing this.

Let me remind my colleagues, too, that the Russians continue to play a very, very destructive role in the country. This past week alone, Russian authorities detained Yuras Zyankovich, a Belarusian lawyer and U.S. citizen.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MEIJER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 124, a resolution to support the people of Belarus in their efforts against corruption and kleptocracy.

On August 9, 2020, Belarus held a presidential election marred by credible reports of widespread election manipulation. Not surprisingly, the Belarusian dictator, Alyaksandr Lukashenka, who has ruled with an iron fist for nearly three decades, commanded an authoritarian 80 percent of the vote.

Since August, Belarusians have taken to the streets peacefully to express their desire for self-determination. Instead of heeding their calls, the regime has responded with extreme violence, arbitrary detention, torture, and other systematic violations of human rights.

This resolution sends a clear message that we in Congress support the Belarusian people and their aspirations for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote from all of my colleagues. Passage of this resolution will send a message that we in Congress stand against the violent crackdown of the Lukashenka regime and stand with the people of Belarus.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today, the people of Belarus know that they are not alone, that they have the support of the United States Congress and the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I join with Ranking Member MCCAUL that this resolution makes it clear that the United States will not be silent on human rights violations as perpetrated by the illegitimate Lukashenko regime and we stand with the Belarusian people in their peaceful fight for democracy. I hope all join in supporting this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 124, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

YOUNG AFRICAN LEADERS INITIATIVE ACT OF 2021

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 965) to establish a comprehensive United States Government initiative to build the capacity of young leaders and entrepreneurs in Africa, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Young African Leaders Initiative Act of 2021" or "YALI Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Young African Leaders Initiative, launched in 2010, is a signature effort to invest in the next generation of African leaders;

(2) Africa is a continent of strategic importance and it is vital for the United States to support strong and enduring partnerships with the next generation of African leaders; and

(3) the United States Government should prioritize investments to build the capacity of emerging young African leaders in sub-Saharan Africa, including through efforts to enhance leadership skills, encourage entrepreneurship, strengthen public administration and the role of civil society, and connect young African leaders continentally and

globally across the private, civic, and public sectors.

SEC. 3. YOUNG AFRICAN LEADERS INITIATIVE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the Department of State the Young African Leaders Initiative (“YALI”) program.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The YALI program shall seek to build the capacity of young African leaders in sub-Saharan Africa in the areas of business, civic engagement, or public administration, including through efforts to—

(1) support young African leaders by offering professional development, training, and networking opportunities, particularly in the areas of leadership, innovation, civic engagement, elections, human rights, entrepreneurship, good governance, and public administration; and

(2) provide increased economic and technical assistance to young African leaders to promote economic growth and strengthen ties between United States and African businesses.

(c) **FELLOWSHIPS.**—The YALI program shall award fellowships under the Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders program to young African leaders ages 18 to 35 who have demonstrated strong capabilities in entrepreneurship, innovation, public service, and leadership, and who have had a positive impact in their communities, organizations, or institutions.

(d) **REGIONAL LEADERSHIP CENTERS.**—The YALI program shall seek to establish regional leadership centers in sub-Saharan Africa to offer training to young African leaders ages 18 to 35 who have demonstrated strong capabilities in entrepreneurship, innovation, public service and leadership, and who have had a positive impact in their communities, organizations, or institutions.

(e) **ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **UNITED STATES-BASED ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall oversee all United States-based activities carried out under the YALI program, including the following:

(A) The participation of Mandela Washington fellows in a six-week Leadership Institute at a United States university or college in business, civic engagement, or public management, including academic sessions, site visits, professional networking opportunities, leadership training, community service, and organized cultural activities.

(B) The participation by Mandela Washington fellows in an annual Mandela Washington Fellowship Summit, to provide such Fellows the opportunity to meet with United States leaders from the private, public, and non-profit sectors.

(2) **AFRICA-BASED ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, should continue to support YALI programs in sub-Saharan Africa, including the following:

(A) Access to continued leadership training and other professional development opportunities for Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders alumni upon their return to their home countries, including online courses, technical assistance, and access to funding.

(B) Training for young African leaders at regional leadership centers established in accordance with subsection (d), and through online and in-person courses offered by such centers.

(C) Opportunities for networking and engagement with—

(i) other alumni of the Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders;

(ii) alumni of programs at regional leadership centers established in accordance with subsection (d); and

(iii) United States and like-minded diplomatic missions, business leaders, and others as appropriate.

(3) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—To carry out this subsection, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies shall seek to partner with the private sector to pursue public-private partnerships, leverage private sector expertise, expand networking opportunities, and identify funding opportunities as well as fellowship and employment opportunities for participants in the YALI program.

(f) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan for implementing the YALI program, including the following:

(1) A description of clearly defined program goals, targets, and planned outcomes for each year and for the duration of implementation of the program.

(2) A strategy to monitor and evaluate the program and progress made toward achieving such goals, targets, and planned outcomes.

(3) A strategy to ensure the program is promoting United States foreign policy goals in Africa, including ensuring that the program is clearly branded and paired with robust public diplomacy efforts.

(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and publish in a publicly accessible, internet-based form, a report on the following:

(1) The progress made toward achieving the goals, targets, and planned outcomes described in subsection (f)(1), including an overview of the program implemented in the previous year and an estimated number of beneficiaries.

(2) An assessment of how the YALI program is contributing to and promoting United States-Africa relations, particularly in areas of increased private sector investment, trade promotion, support to civil society, improved public administration, and fostering entrepreneurship and youth empowerment.

(3) Recommendations for improvements or changes to the program and implementation plan, if any, that would improve their effectiveness during subsequent years of implementation of the program.

(h) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(i) **SUNSET.**—The requirements of this section shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 965, the YALI Act of 2021, introduced by Representatives KAREN BASS and CHRIS SMITH.

Since 2010 the Young African Leaders Initiative has been building the next generation of Africa's youth to lead the way in civic engagement, entrepreneurship, and business development.

We must remember that by 2050, almost one-third of the world's population will be in Africa, and the United States must continue to forge strong ties with our African partners and cultivate its youth for a future of principled leadership.

By helping Africa's young leaders, YALI remains an important avenue for promoting U.S. foreign policy goals in Africa. It will be key in strengthening our partnerships with African countries that are working to create the pathway for Africa's youth to make positive and enduring impacts on their communities.

If passed, H.R. 965 will provide a strong mandate for the implementation and congressional oversight of YALI and its key initiatives, including the U.S.-based Mandela Washington Fellowship and the Regional Leadership Centers established throughout sub-Saharan Africa.

This, too, is a very important bill. I support it and urge my colleagues to do the same. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WAGNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 965, the Young African Leaders Initiative Act, led by Representative BASS and Representative SMITH.

YALI provides fellowship opportunities at U.S. universities and other training programs at Regional Leadership Centers throughout sub-Saharan Africa on leadership skills, entrepreneurship, and effective public administration.

Not only is this an investment in future generations of African leaders, but this is also effective diplomacy. At a time when the Chinese Communist Party is ramping up exchange programs across the continent and establishing Confucius Institutes, programs like YALI are critical to providing alternate opportunities.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the distinguished president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and esteemed member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of Ms. BASS, the author of this legislation, the Young African Leaders Initiative Act of 2021.

The chairman has described the bill. This is an important piece of legislation, as we help try to nourish and develop the next generation of African leadership.

This is an important initiative for the United States to build on those ties, to build those bridges. I commend Congresswoman BASS for her leadership on the YALI program and for this legislation. I urge its passage. I will include the full statement of Ms. BASS in the RECORD.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I will just say quickly thanks to Representatives BASS and CHRIS SMITH. This will help build the next generation of Africa's youth. I hope all my colleagues will join me in voting for this very important bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 965, the Young African Leaders Initiative Act of 2021, introduced by my good friend and Chairwoman of the Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights Subcommittee, Congresswoman KAREN BASS. Her leadership both on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on this bill is unparalleled, and I am honored to speak on her behalf today.

I also wish to thank Chairman MEEKS and ranking Member MCCAUL for bringing this important legislation to the House floor.

The YALI Act of 2021, is a bipartisan bill that seeks to build the capacity of young African leaders in Africa in the areas of civic engagement, entrepreneurship, and business development by:

Offering professional development and a global network to share expertise, including in the areas of civic leadership, elections, human rights, good governance, and public management;

Providing increased economic and technical assistance to young leaders and entrepreneurs; and strengthening business and economic ties between the United States and the continent;

Awarding Mandela Washington Fellowships to young leaders who have had a positive impact in their communities and demonstrated strong capabilities in entrepreneurship, innovation, public service, and leadership;

Establishing regional leadership centers in sub-Saharan Africa allowing young leaders to strengthen their skills and aptitude in entrepreneurship, innovation, public service, and leadership.

The YALI program has two vital components that will be carried out by participants in the program. The U.S.-based component led by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator for USAID will include the following:

The Mandela Washington Fellows will participate in a six-week Leadership Institute at a U.S.-based university or college focusing on

business, civic engagement, or public management. The sessions will include professional networking opportunities, community service, cultural activities, academic learning, and leadership training.

The Mandela Washington Fellows will also participate in the annual Mandela Washington Fellowship Summit held in Washington, D.C., which will provide an opportunity to meet with U.S. leaders from the private, public, and NGO sectors.

The YALI program was built on the premise of young leaders strengthening their knowledge and skills at U.S. institutions, connecting with other Africans from different regions and countries in Africa, and ensuring young leaders can harness their skills and take them back to their home countries while strengthening their own business, public, and civic spaces.

The YALI Act of 2021 would also continue to allow the United States to support and help strengthen the Africa-based component of the program including:

Quality leadership training, professional development, networking, and online courses for Mandela Washington Fellowship alumni when they return to their home countries;

Opportunities for networking with alumni of the Mandela Washington Fellowship; alumni of participants at the YALI Regional Leadership Centers; and American and African professionals and experts; and

Opportunities through the United States Africa Development Foundation to facilitate professional development and sharing of expertise in the home countries of Mandela Washington Fellowship alumni and throughout the African continent.

Through the implementation of the YALI Act of 2021, the United States will:

Promote U.S. policy goals in Africa by providing tools and resources to help young African leaders develop important skills and connections through online campaigns and public diplomacy initiatives; and establish a system for monitoring, evaluating, and continued improvement of the YALI program.

The bipartisan support of H.R. 965 shows that this bill is critical to U.S. national security. It also highlights that our relationship with Africa is a priority, and we want to continue to rebuild and strengthen our partnership in trade and investment, peace and security, and human rights and good governance, because it is in the best interest of the United States and Africa.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I rise in support H.R. 965, of which I am a cosponsor, introduced by my friend and colleague, chairwoman of the Africa Subcommittee, KAREN BASS, to strengthen and formalize our Young African Leaders Initiative program.

The YALI program identifies and invites young leaders from across the African continent to participate in training programs that enhance their leadership skills. Among these individuals, some are selected to participate in the Mandela Washington Fellowship here in the United States.

I have met and spoken with YALI leaders who have participated in the Mandela Fellowship program through Rutgers University in my home state of New Jersey. They are the leaders of tomorrow.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and again, thank you to Chairwoman BASS for her leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 965, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PROTECTION OF SAUDI DISSIDENTS ACT OF 2021

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1392) to protect Saudi dissidents in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1392

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Jamal Khashoggi, a United States resident, Saudi journalist, and Washington Post columnist, was killed and dismembered in the Saudi consulate in Istanbul, Turkey on October 2, 2018.

(2) At the time of his murder, Khashoggi was living in Virginia under an “O” visa and was in the process of applying for a permanent residency.

(3) A report by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) found that Saudi Arabia's Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman approved an operation in Istanbul, Turkey to capture or kill Khashoggi.

(4) The assessment of the ODNI was based on “the Crown Prince's control of decision-making in the Kingdom, the direct involvement of a key adviser and members of Muhammad bin Salman's protective detail in the operation, and the Crown Prince's support for using violent measures to silence dissidents abroad”.

(5) The report also reiterates that “the Crown Prince has had absolute control of the Kingdom's security and intelligence organizations” since 2017.

SEC. 3. RESTRICTIONS ON TRANSFERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, AND MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT TO SAUDI ARABIA.

(a) INITIAL PERIOD.—During the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may not sell, authorize a license for the export of, or otherwise transfer any defense articles or defense services, design and construction services, or major defense equipment under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) to an intelligence, internal security, or law enforcement agency or instrumentality of the Government of Saudi Arabia, or to any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of such agency or instrumentality.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PERIODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 120-day period beginning after the end of the 120-day period described in subsection (a), and each 120-day period thereafter, the President may not sell, authorize a license for the export of, or otherwise transfer any defense articles or services, design and construction services, or major defense equipment under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), regardless of the amount of such articles, services, or equipment, to an intelligence, internal security, or law enforcement agency or instrumentality of the Government of Saudi Arabia, or to any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of such agency or instrumentality, unless the President has submitted to the chairman and ranking member of the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in paragraph (2).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this paragraph is a certification that contains a determination of the President that, during the 120-day period preceding the date of submission of the certification, the United States Government has not determined that the Government of Saudi Arabia has conducted any of the following activities:

(A) Forced repatriation, intimidation, or killing of dissidents in other countries.

(B) The unjust imprisonment in Saudi Arabia of United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence or the prohibition on these individuals and their family members from exiting Saudi Arabia.

(C) Torture of detainees in the custody of the Government of Saudi Arabia.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The restrictions in this section shall not apply with respect to the sale, authorization of a license for export, or transfer of any defense articles or services, design and construction services, or major defense equipment under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) for use in—

(1) the defense of the territory of Saudi Arabia from external threats; or

(2) the defense of United States military or diplomatic personnel or United States facilities located in Saudi Arabia.

(d) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the restrictions in this section if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report not later than 15 days before the granting of such waiver that contains—

(A) a determination of the President that such a waiver is in the vital national security interests of the United States; and

(B) a detailed justification for the use of such waiver and the reasons why the restrictions in this section cannot be met.

(2) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON CONSISTENT PATTERN OF ACTS OF INTIMIDATION OR HARASSMENT DIRECTED AGAINST INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Section 6 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2756) states that “no transfers or letters of offer may be issued, no credits or guarantees may be extended, and no export licenses may be issued under this Act with respect to any country determined by the President to be engaged in a consistent pattern of acts of intimidation or harassment directed against individuals in the United States”.

(2) Section 6 of the Arms Export Control Act further requires the President to report any such determination promptly to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) whether any official of the Government of Saudi Arabia engaged in a consistent pattern of acts of intimidation or harassment directed against Jamal Khashoggi or any individual in the United States; and

(2) whether any United States-origin defense articles were used in the activities described in paragraph (1).

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 5. REPORT AND CERTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO SAUDI DIPLOMATS AND DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report covering the three-year period preceding such date of enactment regarding whether and to what extent covered persons used diplomatic credentials, visas, or covered facilities to facilitate monitoring, tracking, surveillance, or harassment of, or harm to, other nationals of Saudi Arabia living in the United States.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 120-day period thereafter, the President shall, if the President determines that such is the case, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the United States Government has not determined covered persons to be using diplomatic credentials, visas, or covered facilities to facilitate serious harassment of, or harm to, other nationals of Saudi Arabia living in the United States during the time period covered by each such certification.

(2) FAILURE TO SUBMIT CERTIFICATION.—If the President does not submit a certification under paragraph (1), the President shall—

(A) close one or more covered facilities for such period of time until the President does submit such a certification; and

(B) submit to the appropriate congressional committee a report that contains—

(i) a detailed explanation of why the President is unable to make such a certification;

(ii) a list and summary of engagements of the United States Government with the Government of Saudi Arabia regarding the use of diplomatic credentials, visas, or covered facilities described in paragraph (1); and

(iii) a description of actions the United States Government has taken or intends to

take in response to the use of diplomatic credentials, visas, or covered facilities described in paragraph (1).

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) and the certification and report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the restrictions in this section if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report not later than 15 days before the granting of such waiver that contains—

(A) a determination of the President that such a waiver is in the vital national security interests of the United States; and

(B) a detailed justification for the use of such waiver and the reasons why the restrictions in this section cannot be met.

(2) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) COVERED FACILITY.—The term “covered facility” means a diplomatic or consular facility of Saudi Arabia in the United States.

(3) COVERED PERSON.—The term “covered person” means a national of Saudi Arabia credentialed to a covered facility.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON THE DUTY TO WARN OBLIGATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that Intelligence Community Directive 191 provides that—

(1) when an element of the intelligence community of the United States collects or acquires credible and specific information indicating an impending threat of intentional killing, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping directed at a person, the agency must “warn the intended victim or those responsible for protecting the intended victim, as appropriate” unless an applicable waiver of the duty is granted by the appropriate official within the element; and

(2) when issues arise with respect to whether the threat information rises to the threshold of “duty to warn”, the directive calls for resolution in favor of warning the intended victim.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other relevant United States intelligence agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to—

(1) whether and how the intelligence community fulfilled its duty to warn Jamal Khashoggi of threats to his life and liberty pursuant to Intelligence Community Directive 191; and

(2) in the case of the intelligence community not fulfilling its duty to warn as described in paragraph (1), why the intelligence community did not fulfill this duty.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) DUTY TO WARN.—The term “duty to warn” has the meaning given that term in Intelligence Community Directive 191, as in effect on July 21, 2015.

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given such term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

(4) RELEVANT UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—The term “relevant United States intelligence agency” means any element of the intelligence community that may have possessed intelligence reporting regarding threats to Jamal Khashoggi.

SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1392, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1392, the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021, an important bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Though Saudi Arabia has taken steps to reform, its progress has been marred by the Saudi Government’s brutality against dissidents and most notably the detention and abuse of numerous peaceful protesters and the brutal killing of Washington Post journalist and U.S. resident, Jamal Khashoggi.

The Biden administration’s release of the DNI report was a good step toward accountability for the killing of Jamal Khashoggi, but further steps need to be taken.

This bill imposes reasonable limits on U.S. weapons transfers to Saudi intelligence agencies shown to be involved in the killing of Jamal Khashoggi and political repression until such repression and abuse of dissidents comes to an end.

In conclusion, let me be clear, nothing in this legislation would deny the Saudi Government the ability to defend its territory against attacks from external threats or inhibit its ability

to defend the United States military, diplomatic personnel, or facilities in the kingdom.

It is important that the United States stands clear on these matters, speaking loudly in defense of human rights and taking action when they are grossly violated.

I ask the support of all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, April 16, 2021.

Hon. ADAM B. SCHIFF,

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCHIFF: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1392, Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021. I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

I acknowledge that provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence under House Rule X, and that your Committee will forgo action on H.R. 1392 to expedite floor consideration. I further acknowledge that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in the bill that fall within your jurisdiction. I will also support the appointment of House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Lastly, I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you again for your cooperation regarding the legislation. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

GREGORY W. MEEKS,

Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

April 19, 2021.

Hon. GREGORY MEEKS,

Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MEEKS: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1392, the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021. Certain provisions in the legislation fall within the jurisdiction of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, as set forth in Rule X of the House of Representatives for the 117th Congress.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee’s right to sequential referral. By waiving consideration of the H.R. 1392, the Intelligence Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subjects contained in the bill which fall within Intelligence’s Rule X jurisdiction.

Please place this letter into the committee report for the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

ADAM B. SCHIFF,

Chairman.

Mrs. WAGNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MEEKS and Representative CONNOLLY for working on this compromise text for the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act that strikes an important balance.

The bill we are voting on today shows that we can strongly advocate for human rights in Saudi Arabia and for its nationals abroad without leaving Saudi Arabia and Americans in the region vulnerable to threats from Iran and other malign actors. This bill shows we can protect our values and our security interests at the same time.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), distinguished president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, esteemed member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and author of this important bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank, again, my good friend Mr. MEEKS, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee; Mr. MCCAUL, the ranking member; and my good friend from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for their support on this bipartisan effort.

We cannot sit idly by in this body and watch an American resident, my constituent, brutally murdered and dismembered in the consulate of Saudi Arabia in Istanbul, Turkey. We cannot allow that to go unaddressed. The human rights abuse that represents is all too characteristic of the methods used by certain forces in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia against dissidents.

America remains the beacon of hope for those who seek freedom, basic simple freedoms to express themselves politically, religiously, and to be able to assemble peacefully. This bill ends the impunity against those voices of dissent. This bill provides that beacon of hope for so many who look to this body for protection and safe harbor.

I urge passage of H.R. 1392, Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act, which passed our committee unanimously, with the enlightened leadership of our distinguished chairman, GREGORY MEEKS, who has always committed himself to human rights.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1392, the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021.

Let me start by thanking my friend and the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. GREGORY MEEKS, for his leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor.

In February of this year, more than two years after the cold blooded murder of Washington Post journalist, and my constituent, Jamal Khashoggi, the Director of National Intelligence released a previously classified U.S. intelligence report.

The report clearly stated: “We assess that Saudi Arabia’s Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman approved an operation in Istanbul, Turkey to capture or kill Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi.”

It continued: "We base this assessment on the Crown Prince's control of decision making in the Kingdom, the direct involvement of a key adviser and members of Muhammad bin Salman's protective detail in the operation, and the Crown Prince's support for using violent measures to silence dissidents abroad, including Khashoggi."

Finally, it concluded that "since 2017, the Crown Prince has had absolute control of the Kingdom's security and intelligence organizations, making it highly unlikely that Saudi officials would have carried out an operation of this nature without the Crown Prince's authorization."

We've always known, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman directed the assassination of Jamal Khashoggi.

We also know that this operation is part of a broad and ongoing effort to use violence to intimidate and silence dissidents abroad.

And yet, the previous administration shielded Crown Prince MBS and Saudi Arabia from accountability, signaling this kind of abhorrent behavior was somehow ok, inviting further atrocities.

That impunity ends with this bill.

The Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act will stop the Kingdom and the Crown Prince from acting with impunity to commit gross human rights abuses like these.

My bill is targeted and does four specific things:

One: It limits arms exports to Saudi intelligence, internal security, or law enforcement entities if the President finds that Saudi Arabia has engaged in the following activities:

Forced repatriation, intimidation, or killing of dissidents in other countries;

The unjust imprisonment in Saudi Arabia of United States citizens or residents or the placing of travel restrictions on them or their family members; and

The torture of detainees in the custody of the Government of Saudi Arabia

Two: It requires the closure of one or more Saudi diplomatic facilities if the President finds that Saudi Arabia is using diplomatic or consular personnel to harass or harm Saudi nationals in the United States.

Three: It requires a report on whether Saudi Arabia has been engaged in a consistent pattern of acts of intimidation or harassment directed against individuals in the United States.

Four: Finally, it requires a report on whether the U.S. intelligence community fulfilled its duty to warn Jamal Khashoggi of threats to his life.

These provisions are long overdue.

This bill comes after years of fighting for the victims of Saudi Arabia's war on dissent.

I have spoken out on behalf of Dr. Saad Aljabri and activist and former political prisoner Loujain Al-Hathloul. I am currently fighting for my constituents, Salah Al-Haider and Aziza Al-Yousef, as they battle political persecution in Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia will not change their ways unless we act.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending a message to human rights defenders, dissidents, and journalists worldwide and reaffirm the unshakeable American commitment to basic rights and freedoms.

I ask my colleagues to end the "two-year pageant of impunity" by finally holding Saudi Arabia accountable for Jamal Khashoggi's brutal murder.

I ask my colleagues to support the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, let me just thank again Representative GERRY CONNOLLY for this critical bill holding Saudi Arabia accountable for its brutal suppression of dissidents.

Let me also say this helps ensure that the Saudi diplomatic facilities are not used as a staging ground for their efforts to suppress dissidents.

It is crucial that the United States stand strongly in defense of basic rights and freedom of expression and not allow U.S. weapons or support to be used by Saudi Arabia for the purposes of intimidating, abusing, or even killing peaceful Saudi dissidents.

I hope my colleagues will join me. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEIJER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1392, the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act. Saudi Arabia is one of our strongest partners in the Middle East. That does not mean, however, that we should cast a blind eye to the Kingdom's most brutal human rights violations, including the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a U.S. resident.

This bill, which passed out of the Foreign Affairs Committee with unanimous support, would prohibit arms sales to Saudi Arabia's security services until the President certifies the Saudi government is not conducting flagrant human rights violations such as torture, the intimidation and assassination of dissidents, and the unjust imprisonment of U.S. citizens.

America is a beacon throughout the world because of our commitment to democratic values and our commitment to human rights. Our actions must match our convictions. We can and should leverage our close relationship to promote human rights in Saudi Arabia. This bill would do exactly that—sending a message to our ally that if it continues to engage in such actions, there will be consequences. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1392, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

SECURE AND FAIR ENFORCEMENT BANKING ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1996) to create protections for financial institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related le-

gitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 101, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—321

Adams	Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Donalds	Kuster
Allred	Doyle, Michael	Lamb
Amodei	F.	Langevin
Armstrong	Emmer	Larsen (WA)
Auchincloss	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Axne	Eshoo	LaTurner
Bacon	Espallat	Lawrence
Baird	Estes	Lawson (FL)
Balderson	Evans	Lee (CA)
Banks	Feenstra	Lee (NV)
Barr	Ferguson	Leger Fernandez
Barragán	Fitzgerald	Levin (CA)
Bass	Fitzpatrick	Levin (MI)
Beatty	Fletcher	Lieu
Bera	Foster	Lofgren
Bergman	Frankel, Lois	Long
Beyer	Gaetz	Loudermilk
Bice (OK)	Gallego	Lowenthal
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer
Blumenauer	Garbarino	Luria
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (CA)	Lynch
Bonamici	Garcia (IL)	Mace
Bost	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Bourdeaux	Gimenez	Malliotakis
Bowman	Golden	Maloney,
Boyle, Brendan	Gomez	Carolyn B.
F.	Gonzales, Tony	Maloney, Sean
Brooks	Gonzalez (OH)	Mann
Brown	Gonzalez,	Manning
Brownley	Vicente	Massie
Burchett	Gottheimer	Mast
Bush	Green (TN)	Matsui
Butterfield	Green, Al (TX)	McBath
Cammack	Griffith	McCarthy
Carbajal	Grijalva	McClintock
Cárdenas	Grothman	McCollum
Carson	Hagedorn	McEachin
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	McGovern
Case	Hayes	McKinley
Casten	Hern	McNerney
Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Castro (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Meijer
Cawthorn	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Chu	Hill	Meuser
Ciulline	Himes	Mfume
Clark (MA)	Hinson	Miller (WV)
Clarke (NY)	Hollingsworth	Miller-Meeks
Cleaver	Horsford	Mooney
Clyburn	Houlahan	Moore (AL)
Cohen	Hoyer	Moore (UT)
Cole	Huffman	Moore (WI)
Comer	Issa	Morelle
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Moulton
Cooper	Jacobs (CA)	Mrvan
Correa	Jacobs (NY)	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Jayapal	Nadler
Courtney	Jeffries	Napolitano
Craig	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Neguse
Crenshaw	Johnson (SD)	Nehls
Crist	Johnson (TX)	Newhouse
Crow	Jones	Newman
Cuellar	Joyce (OH)	Norcross
Curtis	Kahele	Norman
Davids (KS)	Kaptur	O'Halleran
Davidson	Katko	Obernolte
Davis, Danny K.	Keating	Ocasio-Cortez
Davis, Rodney	Keller	Omar
Dean	Kelly (IL)	Owens
DeFazio	Kelly (PA)	Pallone
DeGette	Khanna	Panetta
DeLauro	Kildee	Pappas
DelBene	Kilmer	Pascarell
Delgado	Kim (CA)	Payne
Demings	Kim (NJ)	Perlmutter
DeSaulnier	Kind	Perry
Deutch	Kinzing	Peters
Dingell	Kirkpatrick	Phillips

Pingree	Scott, David	Titus
Pocan	Sewell	Tlaib
Porter	Sherman	Tonko
Pressley	Sherrill	Torres (CA)
Quigley	Simpson	Torres (NY)
Raskin	Sires	Trahan
Reed	Slotkin	Trone
Reschenthaler	Smith (WA)	Underwood
Rice (NY)	Smucker	Upton
Rice (SC)	Soto	Valadao
Rodgers (WA)	Spanberger	Van Drew
Rogers (AL)	Spartz	Van Duyne
Ross	Speier	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Stanton	Veasey
Ruiz	Stauber	Velasquez
Ruppersberger	Stefanik	Waltz
Rush	Steube	Wasserman
Ryan	Stevens	Schultz
Salazar	Stivers	Waters
Sánchez	Strickland	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Suozi	Welch
Scanlon	Swalwell	Wexton
Schakowsky	Takano	Wild
Schiff	Taylor	Williams (GA)
Schneider	Tenney	Wilson (FL)
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Womack
Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)	Young
Scott (VA)	Timmons	
Scott, Austin		

NAYS—101

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller (IL)
Allen	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Arrington	Good (VA)	Mullin
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Murphy (NC)
Bentz	Gosar	Nunes
Biggs	Granger	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Graves (MO)	Pence
Brady	Greene (GA)	Pfleger
Buchanan	Guest	Posey
Buck	Guthrie	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Harris	Rose
Budd	Harshbarger	Rosendale
Burgess	Hartzler	Rouzer
Calvert	Herrell	Roy
Carl	Hice (GA)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Sessions
Chabot	Jackson	Smith (MO)
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Jordan	Steel
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Stewart
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Tiffany
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff	Turner
Duncan	LaHood	Wagner
Dunn	LaMalfa	Walberg
Fallon	Lamborn	Walorski
Fischbach	Latta	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Lesko	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Letlow	Wenstrup
Fox	Lucas	Westerman
Franklin, C.	McCaul	Williams (TX)
Scott	McClain	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	McHenry	Wittman

NOT VOTING—7

Boebert	Gibbs	Zeldin
Bustos	Price (NC)	
Clyde	Smith (NE)	

□ 1905

Messrs. DUNCAN, CALVERT, ROGERS of Kentucky, McCAUL, and PFLUGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. McNERNEY and LONG changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)	Beatty	Cárdenas
Allred (Wexton)	(Lawrence)	(Gonzalez,
Baird (Walorski)	Buchanan	Vicente)
Barragán (Beyer)	(Cammack)	Costa (Correa)
Bass (Brownley)	Carbajal (Correa)	

Crenshaw	Lawson (FL)	Omar (Pressley)
(Fallon)	(Evans)	Palazzo
Donalds	Lee (CA)	(Fleischman)
(Cammack)	(Khanna)	Payne (Pallone)
Green, Al (TX)	Lieu (Beyer)	Pocan (Raskin)
(Thompson	Lowenthal	Porter (Wexton)
(MS))	(Beyer)	Rush
Grijalva (García	McEachin	(Underwood)
(IL))	(Wexton)	Sewell (DeBene)
Higgins (NY)	Meng (Clark	Stefanik (Katko)
(Kildee)	(MA))	Trahan (Lynch)
Jackson Lee	Mfume	Watson Coleman
(Butterfield)	(Connolly)	(Pallone)
Kind (Connolly)	Moore (WI)	Welch
Kirkpatrick	(Beyer)	(McGovern)
(Stanton)	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Langevin	(Perlmutter)	(Hayes)
(Lynch)	Napolitano	Wilson (SC)
	(Correa)	(Timmons)

CONDEMNING CONTINUED VIOLATION OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF PEOPLE OF HONG KONG BY PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND GOVERNMENT OF HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 130) condemning the continued violation of rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong by the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Hong Kong special administrative region, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—418

Adams	Brown	Cooper
Aderholt	Brownley	Correa
Agullar	Buchanan	Costa
Allen	Buck	Courtney
Allred	Bucshon	Craig
Amodei	Budd	Crawford
Armstrong	Burchett	Crenshaw
Arrington	Burgess	Crist
Auchincloss	Bush	Crow
Axne	Butterfield	Cuellar
Babin	Calvert	Curtis
Bacon	Cammack	Davids (KS)
Baird	Carbajal	Davidson
Balderson	Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.
Banks	Carl	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Carson	Dean
Barragán	Carter (GA)	DeFazio
Bass	Carter (TX)	DeGette
Beatty	Cartwright	DeLauro
Bentz	Case	DelBene
Bera	Casten	Delgado
Bergman	Castor (FL)	Demings
Beyer	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Bice (OK)	Cawthorn	DesJarlais
Biggs	Chabot	Deutch
Bilirakis	Cheney	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Dingell
Bishop (NC)	Ciilline	Doggett
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Donalds
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Bonamici	Cleaver	F.
Bost	Cline	Duncan
Bourdeaux	Cloud	Dunn
Bowman	Clyburn	Emmer
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	Escobar
F.	Cole	Eshoo
Brady	Comer	Estes
Brooks	Connolly	Evans

Fallon	Kustoff	Porter
Feenstra	LaHood	Posey
Ferguson	LaMalfa	Pressley
Fischbach	Lamb	Price (NC)
Fitzgerald	Lamborn	Quigley
Fitzpatrick	Langevin	Raskin
Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)	Reed
Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Reschenthaler
Fortenberry	Latta	Rice (NY)
Foster	LaTurner	Rice (SC)
Fox	Lawrence	Rodgers (WA)
Frankel, Lois	Lawson (FL)	Rogers (AL)
Franklin, C.	Lee (CA)	Rose
Scott	Lee (NV)	Rosendale
Fulcher	Leger Fernandez	Ross
Gaetz	Lesko	Rouzer
Gallagher	Letlow	Roy
Gallego	Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Garamendi	Levin (MI)	Ruiz
Garbarino	Lieu	Ruppersberger
García (CA)	Lofgren	Rush
García (IL)	Long	Rutherford
García (TX)	Loudermilk	Ryan
Jimenez	Lowenthal	Salazar
Golden	Lucas	Sánchez
Gomez	Luetkemeyer	Sarbanes
Gonzales, Tony	Luria	Scalise
Gonzalez (OH)	Lynch	Scanlon
Gonzalez,	Mace	Schakowsky
Vicente	Malinowski	Schiff
Good (VA)	Malliotakis	Schneider
Gooden (TX)	Maloney,	Schrader
Gosar	Carolyn B.	Schrier
Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Schweikert
Granger	Mann	Scott (VA)
Graves (LA)	Manning	Scott, Austin
Graves (MO)	Mast	Scott, David
Green, Al (TX)	Matsui	Sessions
Greene (GA)	McBath	Sewell
Griffith	McCarthy	Sherman
Grijalva	McCaul	Sherrill
Grothman	McClain	Simpson
Guest	McClintock	Sires
Guthrie	McCollum	Slotkin
Hagedorn	McEachin	Smith (MO)
Harder (CA)	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Harris	McHenry	Smith (WA)
Harshbarger	McKinley	Smucker
Hartzler	McNerney	Soto
Hayes	Meeks	Spanberger
Hern	Meijer	Spartz
Herrell	Meng	Speier
Herrera Beutler	Meuser	Stanton
Hice (GA)	Mfume	Stauber
Higgins (LA)	Miller (IL)	Steel
Higgins (NY)	Miller (WV)	Stefanik
Himes	Miller-Meeks	Steil
Hinson	Moolenaar	Steube
Hollingsworth	Mooney	Stevens
Horsford	Moore (AL)	Stewart
Houlahan	Moore (UT)	Stivers
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Strickland
Hudson	Morelie	Suozi
Huffman	Moulton	Swalwell
Huizenga	Mrvan	Takano
Issa	Mullin	Taylor
Jackson	Murphy (FL)	Tenney
Jackson Lee	Murphy (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Jacobs (CA)	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Jacobs (NY)	Napolitano	Thompson (PA)
Jayapal	Neal	Tiffany
Jeffries	Neguse	Timmons
Johnson (GA)	Nehls	Titus
Johnson (LA)	Newhouse	Tlaib
Johnson (OH)	Newman	Tonko
Johnson (SD)	Norcross	Torres (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Norman	Torres (NY)
Jones	Nunes	Trahan
Jordan	O'Halleran	Trone
Joyce (OH)	Obenrolte	Turner
Joyce (PA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Kahele	Omar	Upton
Kaptur	Owens	Valadao
Katko	Palazzo	Van Drew
Keating	Pallone	Van Duyne
Keller	Palmer	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Veasey
Kelly (MS)	Pappas	Vela
Kelly (PA)	Pascarell	Velázquez
Khanna	Payne	Wagner
Kildee	Pelosi	Walberg
Kilmer	Pence	Walorski
Kim (CA)	Perlmutter	Waltz
Kim (NJ)	Perry	Wasserman
Kind	Peters	Schultz
Kinzinger	Pfuger	Waters
Kirkpatrick	Phillips	Watson Coleman
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Weber (TX)
Kuster	Pocan	Webster (FL)

Welch
Wenstrup
Westernman
Wexton
Wild

Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—11

Boebert
Bustos
Clyde
Espallat

Gibbs
Gohmert
Green (TN)
Hill

Rogers (KY)
Smith (NE)
Zeldin

□ 1936

Mr. BABIN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ESPALLAT. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 121.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)	Higgins (NY)	Moulton
Allred (Wexton)	(Kildee)	(Perlmutter)
Baird (Walorski)	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Barragán (Beyer)	(Butterfield)	(Correa)
Bass (Bownley)	Kind (Connolly)	Omar (Pressley)
Beatty	Kirkpatrick	Palazzo
(Lawrence)	(Stanton)	(Fleischman)
Buchanan	Langevin	Payne (Pallone)
(Cammack)	(Lynch)	Pocan (Raskin)
Carbajal (Correa)	Lawson (FL)	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	(Evans)	Rush
(Gonzalez,	Lee (CA)	(Underwood)
Vicente)	(Khanna)	Sewell (DelBene)
Costa (Correa)	Lieu (Beyer)	Stefanik (Katko)
Crenshaw	Lowenthal	Trahan (Lynch)
(Fallon)	(Beyer)	Watson Coleman
Donalds	McEachin	(Pallone)
(Cammack)	(Wexton)	Welch
Green, Al (TX)	Meng (Clark)	(McGovern)
(Thompson	(MA))	Wilson (FL)
(MS))	Mfume	(Hayes)
Grijalva (García	(Connolly)	Wilson (SC)
(IL))	Moore (WI)	(Timmons)
	(Beyer)	

SOUTHEAST ASIA STRATEGIES
ACT

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1083) to require a strategy for engagement with Southeast Asia and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1083

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Southeast Asia Strategy Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Southeast Asia is the fulcrum of the Indo-Pacific region, providing both a geographic and maritime link between East and South Asia.

(2) The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), a regional intergovernmental organization, remains central to the Indo-Pacific region’s institutional architecture and to United States foreign policy toward the region.

(3) The United States has reaffirmed that the security and sovereignty of its Southeast

Asian allies and partners, including a strong, independent ASEAN, remain vital to the prosperity and stability of the Indo-Pacific region.

(4) The United States has committed to deepen longstanding alliances and partnerships with a range of Southeast Asian nations, including by promoting our shared values, democracy, human rights, and civil society.

(5) Since the end of the Second World War, United States investments in strengthening alliances and partnerships with Southeast Asian nations have yielded tremendous returns for United States interests, as working with and through these alliances and partnerships have increased the region’s ability to address common challenges.

(6) ASEAN member states are critical United States security partners in protecting the freedom and openness of the maritime domain and preventing violent extremism and the trafficking of weapons of mass destruction.

(7) ASEAN member states have contributed significantly to regional disaster monitoring and management and emergency response through initiatives such as the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management, an inter-governmental organization that facilitates coordination and cooperation among ASEAN member states and international organizations in times of emergency.

(8) According to the 2018 ASEAN Business Outlook Survey, ASEAN member states are vital to the prosperity of the United States economy and exports to ASEAN economies support more than 500,000 jobs in the United States.

(9) The United States and ASEAN have established a new strategic partnership that will enhance cooperation across the economic, political-security, and people-to-people pillars of the relationship.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) deepen cooperation with ASEAN and ASEAN member states in the interest of promoting peace, security, and stability in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) affirm the importance of ASEAN centrality and ASEAN-led mechanisms in the evolving institutional architecture of the Indo-Pacific region; and

(3) establish and communicate a comprehensive strategy toward the Indo-Pacific region that articulates—

(A) the role and importance of Southeast Asia to the United States;

(B) the value of the United States-ASEAN relationship;

(C) the mutual interests of all parties;

(D) the concrete and material benefits all nations derive from strong United States engagement and leadership in Southeast Asia; and

(E) efforts to forge and maintain ASEAN consensus, especially on key issues of political and security concern to the region, such as the South China Sea.

SEC. 4. STRATEGY FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH SOUTHEAST ASIA AND ASEAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies as appropriate, shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive strategy for engagement with Southeast Asia and ASEAN.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A statement of enduring United States interests in Southeast Asia and a description

of efforts to bolster the effectiveness of ASEAN.

(2) A description of efforts to—

(A) deepen and expand Southeast Asian alliances, partnerships, and multilateral engagements, including efforts to expand broad based and inclusive economic growth, security ties, security cooperation and interoperability, economic connectivity, and expand opportunities for ASEAN to work with other like-minded partners in the region; and

(B) encourage like-minded partners outside of the Indo-Pacific region to engage with ASEAN.

(3) A summary of initiatives across the whole of the United States Government to strengthen the United States partnership with Southeast Asian nations and ASEAN, including to promote broad based and inclusive economic growth, trade, investment, energy innovation and sustainability, public-private partnerships, physical and digital infrastructure development, education, disaster management, public health and global health security, and economic, political, and public diplomacy in Southeast Asia.

(4) A summary of initiatives across the whole of the United States Government to enhance the capacity of Southeast Asian nations with respect to enforcing international law and multilateral sanctions, and initiatives to cooperate with ASEAN as an institution in these areas.

(5) A summary of initiatives across the whole of the United States Government to promote human rights and democracy, to strengthen the rule of law, civil society, and transparent governance, to combat disinformation and to protect the integrity of elections from outside influence.

(6) A summary of initiatives to promote security cooperation and security assistance within Southeast Asian nations, including—

(A) maritime security and maritime domain awareness initiatives for protecting the maritime commons and supporting international law and freedom of navigation in the South China Sea; and

(B) efforts to combat terrorism, human trafficking, piracy, and illegal fishing, and promote more open, reliable routes for sea lines of communication.

(c) DISTRIBUTION OF STRATEGY.—For the purposes of assuring allies and partners in Southeast Asia and deepening United States engagement with ASEAN, the Secretary of State shall direct each United States chief of mission to ASEAN and its member states to distribute the strategy required by subsection (a) to host governments.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. NEWMAN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 1083.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Southeast Asia Strategy Act, of which I am a proud Democratic lead on the bill.

In 2017, Congresswoman WAGNER and I cofounded the Congressional Caucus on ASEAN to strengthen our Nation's relationships in Southeast Asia. ASEAN and its member nations are of critical importance to the United States. Enduring organizations like ASEAN will be key to maintaining a free and open Indo-Pacific.

The United States is already making key investments in the region alongside allies and partners like Japan, Australia, and India—notably, the recent Quad commitment to fund, manufacture, and distribute vaccines across Southeast Asia.

The Southeast Asia Strategy Act will build on these investments by reinforcing ASEAN centrality as U.S. policy and directing the Secretary of State to develop a comprehensive plan for engaging the institution and the region it represents.

This legislation comes at a crucial time for Southeast Asia, notably amidst the deteriorating situation in Myanmar following the recent military coup.

Given the significant and rapidly developing events in the region, Congress must send a message of the importance of the region by passing this bill.

It is also important that the administration nominates a U.S. Ambassador to ASEAN as quickly as possible. It is also imperative that the administration consistently sends senior officials to regional summits. Our Nation needs a voice in Southeast Asia now more than ever.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and help build stronger ties between the United States and the peoples of Southeast Asia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1083, the Southeast Asia Strategy Act, important legislation that I introduced to ensure the United States engages proactively and meaningfully in a critical region of the world.

This powerhouse region joins the Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean regions and serves as a conduit for global trade. The Southeast Asian states are increasingly vital to the prosperity of the U.S. economy, generating hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

The People's Republic of China, eager to undermine U.S. interests in this key region, is aggressively working to expand its influence in Southeast Asia. It seeks to exploit its predatory investment, development, and trade policies;

illegal military installations in the South China Sea; and disinformation campaigns to coerce countries to accept its agenda.

The United States has long enjoyed strong relations with Southeast Asia, and it must now fully realize this strategic partnership. The Southeast Asia Strategic Act will ensure the United States develops and communicates a coherent regional strategy that addresses all aspects of the relationship, from trade and humanitarian goals to diplomatic and security arrangements.

We have a national interest in sustaining U.S. leadership in Southeast Asia, supporting human rights and respect for democratic freedoms, and articulating our strategic priorities.

We will find willing partners in our many friends and allies in the region that share our grave concerns regarding China's belligerence and growing power.

I thank Representative CASTRO, with whom I co-chair the Congressional Caucus on ASEAN, for working with me on this legislation. Congress' strong bipartisan support for U.S. engagement in Southeast Asia sends an unmistakable message of American resolve and leadership to the region.

Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1083, the Southeast Asia Strategy Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

H.R. 1083, the Southeast Asia Strategies Act, introduced by Mrs. WAGNER, is important legislation that will recommit the United States to strengthening and deepening our ties to southeast Asia and the ASEAN economic union. This bill will reinforce the United States' cooperation with countries in the Indo-Pacific region and lay the groundwork for improved engagement and increased prosperity for America and its partner nations.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1083.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TROPICAL FOREST AND CORAL REEF CONSERVATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 241) to reauthorize the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act of 1998.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 241

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 806(d) of the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2431d(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(9) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2022.

"(10) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

"(11) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.

"(12) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2025.

"(13) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2026."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 241.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 241, the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2021, introduced by Mr. CHABOT.

In this Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee aims to reprioritize and redouble our legislative efforts related to the environment, conservation, and climate change. Climate change already poses a significant threat, and what we do now will significantly impact how damaging climate change will be in the years to come.

If we do not act now, we will fail to mitigate the adverse effects posed by climate change. We will see growing food insecurity, migration and conflict, threatening our shared interests and security.

President Biden has already set a positive, ambitious agenda for international climate action. His first summit, the Climate Leaders Summit, will take place this very week, on April 22, during which the United States will reclaim its leadership role in galvanizing international support for protecting our planet.

We will continue to work closely with other nations in the lead-up to the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Glasgow this November and beyond, understanding that nothing short of an international response can meet this incredible challenge.

We have our work cut out for us, no doubt, which is why I am pleased to

bring forth this excellent bipartisan measure that would reauthorize the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act. This highly successful debt-for-nature program has yielded tangible environmental benefits and returns on investment since first enacted in 1998. It offers eligible countries the opportunity to reduce debt owed to the United States when they invest in local ecologically and economically vital forest and coral reef ecosystems.

It is a win-win situation. According to the Congressional Research Service, since 1998, restructured debt agreements have saved more than 67 million acres of tropical forests in countries such as Botswana, Brazil, the Philippines, and Indonesia. They help strengthen civil society in conservation and environmental protection efforts and build public-private partnerships in developing countries, thereby advancing U.S. international development and democracy objectives.

Furthermore, these agreements help reduce the debt in these developing countries, lessening fiscal pressures, promoting capital market reforms, and stimulating economic growth while helping to protect the environment.

The world's forests are nature's lungs, and the ocean's coral reefs support a quarter of all marine life. This legislation puts in place economic incentives that can help drive good environmental stewardship, while promoting robust democracies and economic growth overseas.

I am pleased to support this important bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise this evening in support of H.R. 241, the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2021, bipartisan legislation that I introduced along with my Democratic colleague, Mr. SHERMAN of California, earlier this year.

Developing countries are home to some of the world's most endangered and biologically diverse tropical forests and coral reefs. These critical ecosystems support the livelihoods of local populations, not to mention an abundance of animal species. Coral reefs are critical to the world's fish stocks and are magnets for tourism and the accompanying economic growth. It is in the interest of the whole world to protect and responsibly manage both tropical rainforests and coral reefs.

Unfortunately, however, whether it is deforestation, pollution, overfishing, or some other cause, these vital natural resources are threatened across the globe.

Today's legislation seeks to safeguard tropical forests and coral reefs by revitalizing the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act of 1998. Since the introduction of this legisla-

tion 23 years ago, this effort has been led by Ohio's great Senator, ROB PORTMAN, who was in the House at that time and who is leading the effort in the Senate one more time before he leaves office. Congressman SHERMAN and I were cosponsors of that effort back in 1998, and we are proud of its results over the years.

This program has already protected, as my colleague from Texas mentioned, 67 million acres of tropical forests across the globe. In terms of carbon emission, that is the equivalent of taking 11 million cars off the road.

This program does development right. It forgives debt, which some developing nations owe the United States, in exchange for investment in local conservation. Instead of providing a handout with questionable results, the debt forgiveness comes with requirements that ensure that the money grows local economies and benefits those who rely on healthy ecosystems the most.

Also, by assisting developing countries to properly manage and sustainably develop their own resources, it follows the old adage of "teaching a man to fish" so that the American taxpayer doesn't have to keep providing the fish.

Our constituents back home are rightfully skeptical oftentimes about foreign aid because we have a lot of ineffective programs that spend their money year after year without moving countries towards self-reliance. We owe it to the American taxpayers to ensure that aid programs are targeted, effective, and come to an end. H.R. 241 is all three.

Further, due to the peculiar structure of the type of debt this program forgives, developing countries would not have been paying back the portion that we are forgiving anytime soon anyway. A lot of it has already been outstanding for 10, 20, or even 30 years. Since the U.S. is unlikely to recoup the debt in a reasonable timeframe anyway, we might as well get something in return that benefits those countries, benefits us, and really benefits the entire world and those ecosystems and those forests and the animals that reside there and the coral reefs and the fish and other life that is there. So, really, it benefits so many.

Finally, our legislation is one more tool to counter China. Whereas China's One Belt One Road initiative oftentimes produces corrupt, elite-centered, get-rich-quick debt traps, our program is exactly the opposite. It brings transparency to natural resource management by engaging civil society, focuses on the people who depend on these ecosystems for food and economic activity instead of on elites, fosters sustainable development and is debt forgiveness instead of a debt trap. The One Belt One Road initiative oftentimes gets these countries in a huge debt trap that they never get out of, and China benefits instead of the countries that one thinks might benefit from One Belt One Road.

With this program, the State Department can showcase the U.S. development model and bring real gains in the developing world. It is in the interest of the whole world to protect tropical forests and coral reefs. This program does so in a targeted, proven, sustainable way, and pays for it by forgiving debt we would never have seen repaid anyway.

In my mind, this is a win for the taxpayer, a win for the developing countries, a win for America, and a win for the whole world. I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I, again, thank BRAD SHERMAN, Democratic congressman from California, for his cosponsorship and his leadership on this.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I will close by saying this is really a good bill. I thank Senator ROB PORTMAN also for his leadership on this here in the House, when he was here, and then over in the Senate. We took this up after he left the House and have been working on it for years.

I thank Mr. SHERMAN and a lot of Republicans and Democrats for working on this together. This is bipartisan legislation that really does benefit the whole world. I wish we did more stuff like this around here.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 241, introduced by Mr. CHABOT, is a bipartisan bill that reauthorizes the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act.

The debt-for-nature swaps created by this program have been highly successful in generating support for tropical forest or coral reef conservation activities in exchange for relieving debt owed to the United States Government. This bill is a win-win, protecting forest and coral reef ecosystems, lessening the fiscal burden of low-income countries, and stimulating economic growth in local communities.

I hope my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, will join me in supporting this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 241.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING ROBERT LEDER

(Mr. TORRES of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, Robert Leder, as his name would suggest, was a natural leader, loved by the thousands of students whose lives he lifted.

I, for one, would not be here were it not for Robert Leder, who set me on a trajectory that led from public housing in the Bronx to the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. My story is a mere footnote in the much larger legacy of public service that Robert Leder left behind after his passing in 2018.

Mr. Leder entered public education in the 1960s as a Spanish teacher. In the late 1970s, he rose to become the principal of Herbert H. Lehman High School in the Bronx, a position he held for nearly three decades, making him, at the time, the longest-serving educator in America's largest city. As principal, he knew the name of every student. He held everyone around him to the highest standards, but he held himself to the highest standard of all.

We, the alumni of Lehman High School, will always love you, Mr. Leder. We will never forget you.

I will not always be a Member of Congress, but I will always be the grateful student of the greatest educator I have ever known, Robert Leder. May he rest in peace.

□ 2000

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Week of the Young Child. Sponsored by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the Week of the Young Child focuses on celebrating early learning, young children, their teachers, families, and communities.

This year's celebration took place from April 10th to the 16th. The National Association for the Education of Young Children first established the Week of the Young Child in 1971, recognizing the early childhood years lay the foundation for children's success in school and later in life.

Children's earliest years are the most important when it comes to shaping their learning and development. High-quality early care and educational services directly correlate to the health and well-being of our communities.

Madam Speaker, with more than 400 childcare facilities in my district, and as a senior member of the Education and Labor Committee, I understand the importance of quality early care and

education experiences as well as access to high-quality care.

Madam Speaker, let's take a moment to recognize the vital work performed by early childcare and education professionals and express our gratitude.

RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST UKRAINE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus, I rise today with deep concern regarding the Kremlin's increased aggression toward our ally, Ukraine.

Currently, Russia is amassing troops in and close to Ukraine. Ukrainian officials estimate about 80,000 Russian troops are amassed on its border.

U.S. European Command General Tod Wolters said, the current Russian force mirrors the size of the infiltration of forces that occurred back in 2014 when Russia illegally invaded Ukrainian territory.

This aggression serves one purpose: Russia's hybrid warfare to threaten the security of the Transatlantic Alliance.

I am so grateful to President Biden for his exceptional leadership and support for Ukraine, and I agree completely that there must be serious consequences should Russia escalate further. I am also thankful for the administration's latest round of punitive sanctions on Russia given its malign behavior.

To strengthen Ukraine's deterrence capabilities, our caucus spearheaded efforts to increase Ukraine's defense assistance funding by \$25 million, up to \$275 million in fiscal year 2021, and to place mandatory sanctions on Nord Stream 2.

Our caucus stands ready to support NATO and the Transatlantic Alliance to ensure the protection of Ukraine's sovereignty.

ENDORSEMENT OF VIOLENCE IS UNCONSCIONABLE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise out of great concern for the violence and looting that has taken over Minneapolis. Even more troubling is the seeming endorsement and, yes, incitement of it by Members of this body.

It is unconscionable that a Member of Congress sent to Washington to make the laws that govern our Nation would encourage Americans to disregard those laws. Yet one of our Democratic colleagues, only one day after 136 rioters were arrested, called for protesters to "stay on the street," "get more active," and "get more confrontational" against our law enforcement, urging this escalation by

asking protesters to ignore the city-wide curfew. Hours later, that inevitable escalation did occur, with National Guardsmen and police being fired upon.

These are very dangerous actions. Is this the standard by which we want this House to represent the people of this country, that incitement? I recall a lot of talk some months ago about a much lesser speech being inciteful, language must less geared toward that being inciteful, yet it happens here.

Strong action needs to be taken by Speaker PELOSI and this House against these types of words.

SECURITY ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss one of the most important problems facing our country, and that is security on our southern border.

I don't think there is any question that most Americans agree that our immigration system is broken, but before we can fix it, we have to address the crisis at our southern border.

And let's be clear, what is happening at the border is a crisis. In fact, the President admitted as much recently. His commander of Public Health Service at the convention center in Dallas, when I went to visit there, maintained that they were in crisis management. You don't manage a crisis unless you are in a crisis, so it is a crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis.

The policies being put forward by this administration, basically absolutely opening the border are, in fact, inhumane. Smugglers, traffickers, foreign banks are profiting and enticing a hopeless people into sending their children or themselves to make this dangerous journey to unlawfully cross our southern border. These bad actors know how to manipulate our laws to their advantage. Putting forward policies that make it easier for them to do so is, in fact, wrong.

During the month of March record numbers of unaccompanied alien children were referred to the Office of Refugee Resettlement at the Department of Health and Human Services. The total number of people coming in without authorization is the highest it has been in 15 years. Customs and Border Protection encountered over 170,000 individuals along our southern border attempting to cross without authorization. Many of them were single adults.

Over the last month, Members from both sides of the aisle, both sides of the Capitol flocked to our southern border to see and assess the situation for

themselves. They held press conferences. They did television interviews and press releases. Yet the reaction from the White House was one of denial.

A little less than 30 days ago President Biden named Vice President HARRIS to be the point person for the administration to bring a resolution to the problems on our southern border. But the Vice President has not ventured to the southern border. She has not had a press conference about what is happening, and certainly we have seen no plan.

It was announced last week that she would be traveling to the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. This would be a great first step. But to fully understand what is happening, Madam Vice President, you need to visit our southern border.

Right now, hundreds of thousands of people come across our southern border from Mexico and from Central American countries through Mexico. And among these thousands are unaccompanied children, who are used as pawns to take advantage of the administration not enforcing our immigration laws. Now smugglers have no issue with using these children as pawns.

From the numbers, we know that America is one of the most generous countries in the world when it comes to accepting migrants. Through our Nation's legal immigration process, we welcome over a million immigrants into America each year. To be clear, these are immigrants who are going through the normal and correct process, waiting in line and following our laws. But how discouraging must it be for them to watch as others take full advantage of our laws not being enforced because of Washington putting forward poor policy. Despite the generosity of the American people, others remain intent on entering our country without the full benefit of the law behind them.

To better understand this problem, it is perhaps important to examine its roots. In 2018 it was important for me to visit Northern Triangle countries for myself to see the situation on the ground, to assess the situation, and determine how the United States can better help and better address the root causes of irregular migration.

The Energy and Commerce Committee, which I am a member of, does not oversee foreign policy, but it does have jurisdiction over the Department of Health and Human Services and subsequently the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which does take care of children who end up in the United States from one of those Northern Triangle countries.

I learned that there are different drivers for people to migrate from each of those countries. There is, unfortunately, corruption at the highest levels of government in that region. One common theme, however, is campaign rhetoric that places an "open for business" sign on our border.

The vast majority of people in the Northern Triangle countries do live below the poverty level and lack the job opportunities to escape these conditions.

In El Salvador there are problems with gangs, and the gangs are violent, medieval levels of violence and brutality. Many of the individuals serving in their government are holdovers from revolutionaries in the civil war which ended over 20 years ago.

Honduras is a country that is a through point for narcotics trafficking and, as a consequence, has many of the problems that you would imagine would be attendant with that type of activity. The current President ran for a second term. Although the law limited him to a single term the Supreme Court gave him a favorable decision. Unfortunately, he won with a very bare majority that only was determined many days after, some significant time after the election. Stop me if you have ever heard this before. But the Honduran President is now subject to extensive protests throughout his country that question the legitimacy of his Presidency.

I will say that the First Lady of Honduras, who has headed a task force aimed at addressing irregular migration, is performing a valuable service. The desire to make change is present, but some of the resources and capacity are lacking.

In Guatemala corruption is rampant at every level of government. There are only a couple of ministers who can be trusted. The corruption is, in this case, exacerbated by term limits because the President can only serve one term, and apparently there is a notion in the country that it is important for the President to prepare for the life after the Presidency while they are in office, so they do not have their focus on performing in the public good.

There is also a significant prejudice against some of the indigenous people in the western highlands of Guatemala. These individuals do make up the majority of migrants who are leaving Guatemala. Guatemala, unfortunately, has one of the highest rates of malnutrition in the world, and there is very little effort to combat this because of the lack of resolve of their central government.

In my travels to the Northern Triangle, I learned that there are people in those countries who do desire their children stay home. They understand the difficulty, the danger in exporting all of your young people. They do not want irregular migration. They do not want mass migration to happen. However, unfortunately, their governments have yet to eradicate the corruption from within.

For example, they do not prohibit financial institutions from contributing to the problem of these desperate populations. The financing of human trafficking from these countries is extremely profitable. Beyond the danger to the migrant, the journey from the

Northern Triangle to our southern border is not cheap. It varies what the estimates are, but families take out loans from \$1,000 to \$10,000 in order to smuggle someone to the United States.

Children that enter the United States will sometimes go to work to send remittances back to their homes so that their family is able to pay off the loan. In fact, it is estimated that as much as 20 percent of the GDP of Honduras comes in the form of remittances, so it is disturbing to learn that legitimate banks in Northern Triangle countries may be in this way aiding the human smuggling trade. It does seem like it is being fueled by cash from sources from which it should not come.

□ 2015

One clear solution to the corruption of these countries is to give more aid to the Bureau of International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement, a United Nations organization; non-governmental organizations and non-profits; the United States Agency for International Development, USAID; the International Organization for Migration; and other nongovernmental entities.

In addition, the United States Development Finance Corporation, previously known as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, is facilitating needed investment in the region, and numerous nonprofits and NGOs have set up programs to help poverty-stricken and recent returnees.

One of my fears is what you hear discussed. Increasing the amount of aid to Central American countries will help with this problem. I would simply argue that the money not necessarily go to the governments that are not doing their jobs but to these non-governmental agencies, USAID, and the U.S. Development Finance Corporation, which will provide the economic benefit needed by the people who find it necessary to undergo that irregular migration because their economic circumstances are so dire.

In other words, the governments are not the ones that need the aid. The aid needs to be placed in the hands of those who can and will help the people. The answer to this humanitarian crisis is to not give more aid to the governments of the countries that are failing but to keep supporting the community-building organizations that are on the ground and working to serve their people.

In line with this solution, in September 2018, I introduced H. Res. 1092, expressing the sense of the House that the President should redirect foreign assistance given to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras away from their central governments and toward the driving causes of illegal immigration into the United States and to those nongovernmental organizations. I have reintroduced this as H. Res. 17 in this Congress.

The inability of the central governments of those countries to deal with

and solve these issues has left over half of their populations living in poverty. In fact, millions of El Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans face hunger at points each year.

This is why foreign assistance must be targeted toward the municipal and regional governments in these countries, as well as community-building organizations that have a direct impact on the lives of the people. Simply giving more aid to the central governments when it is not getting to where it is needed is unlikely to solve the problem.

The amount of foreign assistance could be determined by multiplying the number of unaccompanied alien children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras and redirecting that amount for each country to these non-central government entities.

Focusing on where aid is directed is an essential part of the solution. That is why, in December 2018, I offered an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act to redirect foreign aid to nongovernmental organizations in Northern Triangle countries and Mexico from being given to the central governments.

Instead, this funding would only be given to regional or municipal governments or educational institutions in these countries, private entities, or other nongovernmental organizations, or faith-based organizations operating in these countries.

To keep individuals, particularly unaccompanied alien children, from arriving at our southern border, the help necessary to make their homes safer and more prosperous is not through their central governments but for institution-building and other areas that can provide them the help they need to show that we are serious and to demonstrate to the central governments of the Northern Triangle countries that the United States cannot be constant caretakers for their children.

To that end, I have introduced several times the Unaccompanied Alien Children Assistance Control Act to withhold aid from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras by the number of children in Federal custody due to their immigration status, multiplied by a multiplier, which is the estimated cost of caring for one unaccompanied alien child.

We should not be surprised that the reversal of the previous administration's immigration policies led to an influx of unlawful crossings at our southern borders. I would take issue with the fact that this is said to be a cyclical uptick. Yes, there are cyclical variations to the number of people who do cross our southern border, but this one is not a cyclical uptick. This influx is a direct result of a policy choice made by the Biden administration.

We faced a similar crisis in 2014, when President Biden was Vice President, and President Obama's administration instituted the dangerous catch and release policy that led to a flood of

unauthorized migrants and unaccompanied minors coming across our southern border. Instead of keeping those who made unauthorized crossings in custody, our immigration and enforcement agencies were required to release those individuals into our country.

People were given a court date, but few, if any, would actually appear. Beyond missing a court date, unauthorized migrants took advantage of our system. Unfortunately, the diversion of so many people coming across the border, the diversion of the attention of our law enforcement officials on the border, has allowed for the free importation of drugs like fentanyl and heroin across our border.

Due to those failures, it is understandable why the previous administration instituted a policy that required the enforcement of our laws. For 4 years, we listened to Members of Congress have these discussions on the border and in the Halls of Congress about the misfortune of those who crossed into our country without the benefit of citizenship.

But what exactly does it mean to put forward a zero-tolerance policy? It means enforcing the laws and giving needed support to our frontline border officials.

No one wants to see a child separated from their parents. This is a problem that Congress needs to fix. It is a problem that Congress can fix.

To understand why this has happened, we look back to the court case of *Reno v. Flores* in 1997, and we look at the asylum laws that were passed in late 2008.

The *Flores* settlement prohibited the detention of children from a noncontiguous country for more than 20 days. After those 20 days, they are placed in the care of the Office of Refugee Resettlement if they cannot be reunited with family.

Previously, when adults attempted to cross into the United States without authorization, they were placed in immigration detention to await an immigration hearing. But due to the backlog of immigration cases, these adults were being held longer than 20 days. If they entered with a child, the *Flores* settlement required that the child be released. Therefore, the adults were also being released with them, and very few ever showed up for their immigration proceedings.

It changed during the Trump administration. They held unauthorized adults rather than releasing them. And if they entered with children, those children were placed in the care of the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

People claimed this was inhumane. If enforcing our laws is inhumane, then we need to change the law. But it seems like what is inhumane is incentivizing an already desperate people to make the dangerous journey to our southern border. To do that in the first place seems inhumane.

We must realize that far too many children are being smuggled into our

country by adults who want to prey on the generosity of Americans. A significant number of adults with children are not even biological relatives to the child with whom they enter. Traffickers, cartels, and smugglers know how to take advantage of a humanitarian crisis.

Being a father and a grandfather, I truly mean it when I say that no one wants to separate a child from their parents. That is why, on September 25, during the Rules Committee hearing, I offered an amendment requiring a plan to promptly reunify children in the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

It is not inhumane to enforce laws. Putting forth policies that allow children to be used as pawns is itself inhumane. Trekking a child across multiple countries just to smuggle them illegally into another country, that is inhumane.

Stated another way, our laws are not inhumane; nonenforcement is leading to inhumane actions by desperate people. We need to help them at home, not here where the taxpayer is on the hook.

For anyone who turns on the news, you can see the terrible and disheartening situation at the border. So, today, the question is asked: Why would anyone object to enforcement of our laws?

There is significant proof that a zero-tolerance policy for violating our laws is a deterrent for people subjecting themselves to harm by taking a perilous trip to the American southern border.

For example, in early 2017, Department of Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly visited the southern border. It was virtually deserted. In June 2017, a Reuters journalist, Julia Edwards Ainsley, reported on the decreased number of border crossings. She wrote: "Last fall, during the waning months of the Obama administration, hundreds of immigrants crossed the river on rafts at this point each day, many willingly handing themselves over to immigration authorities in hopes of being released into the United States to await court proceedings that would decide their fate."

"Now, the agents look out on an empty landscape. Footpaths up from the water have started to disappear under growing brush, with only the stray baby shoe or toothbrush serving as reminders of that migrant flood."

"The reason for the change, the agents say, is a perception in Mexico and Central America that President Trump has ended the practice known as catch and release, in which immigrants caught in the United States without proper documents were released to live free, often for years, as their cases ran through the court system."

"Now, would-be violators know 'they will be detained and turned right back around,' said one of the two agents, Marlene Castro. 'It is not worth it anymore.'"

So said Julia Edwards Ainsley in June 2017.

What happened between the Obama years and the first years of the Trump administration? When people believe that they will encounter a border wall, or that they will be turned away at the border, they simply do not come.

Our laws are only effective if they are enforced. If Congress truly wants to repair our immigration system, we, the Members of Congress, are obligated to act.

We know this is not the first time in American history that an administration has used a zero-tolerance policy. Over 40 years ago, during the Carter administration, between April 15 and October 31, 1980, there was a mass emigration of Cubans. They left from Cuba's Mariel Harbor to travel to the United States. We remember this as the Mariel boatlift. Because of this emigration, Fidel Castro decided to open his prisons and mental health facilities, sending those Cubans through the Straits of Florida to the United States. President Carter's administration was left grappling with a Cuban refugee crisis.

In a 1997 interview, former Deputy Secretary of State John Bushnell recalled a meeting with President Carter in which he and other key advisers discussed solutions to the Cuban refugee problem:

I remember sitting in that windowless conference room of the National Security Council with the Secretary of State, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Director of the CIA, the head of the Coast Guard, the head of INS, and several other senior officials, debating how to stop this flow of Cubans. National Security Advisor Brzezinski chaired until Carter came in toward the end of the meeting.

There was a long discussion on how the Coast Guard and Navy ships might physically stop the Cuban boats either from leaving the United States or returning back with the Cubans in the Mariel Boatlift. The Navy and Coast Guard, represented at this meeting by admirals, were concerned.

"How can we do this?" they said, and it was suggested that the boats simply could be stopped, physically prevented from entering the United States, without any major loss of life of the passengers. But they did suggest ways of maneuvering the boats to block their passage, which struck me as sort of wild. It sounded to me like they had in mind a picket line of Coast Guard and Navy boats going across the Straits of Florida to stop the movement of these small boats with refugees. This naval discussion went on for a long time but eventually was inconclusive.

Perhaps wisely so.

But from this interview, we understand that President Carter's administration was contemplating how to physically stop Cuban boats from coming to the United States.

Then, moving forward to the early 1990s, rafts of immigrants from Haiti bound for the United States were intercepted at sea, as authorized by policy enacted by President Bush's administration.

□ 2030

A young governor from Arkansas used divisive campaign rhetoric as he

ran against George H.W. Bush for President. Then-Governor Clinton time and again spoke of his disagreement with President Bush's zero-tolerance immigration policy.

During his campaign, Governor Clinton often maligned President Bush for being cruel in the treatment of Haitian refugees traveling to America via boat. Some feared that he was creating an unrealistic expectation for the Haitian people, who were suffering from significant unrest in their country.

In the New York Times, an article entitled, "Clinton Inspires Hope and Fear in Haiti," a writer, Douglas Farah, wrote: "It was Mr. Clinton who helped create the expectation of an exodus from Haiti when he condemned the Bush administration for a 'cruel policy of returning Haitian refugees to a brutal dictatorship without an asylum hearing.'"

We all know from our history in November of 1992, Governor Clinton won the Presidential election. Because of President-elect Clinton's promises, the people of Haiti anticipated being welcomed into the United States with open arms. The problem is, after securing the White House, President Clinton changed his mind after learning that perhaps the true toll such an exodus would take as people took to the waters in unseaworthy boats.

In a Voice of America address on January 14, 1993—a mere week before he took the oath of office—President-elect Clinton walked back his promise. Let me just read some of President-elect Clinton's remarks that he spoke directly to the people of Haiti over the Voice of America.

"For Haitians who do seek to leave Haiti, boat departure is a terrible and dangerous choice. I've been deeply concerned by reports that many of you are preparing to travel by boat to the United States. And, I fear that boat departures in the near future would result in further tragic losses of life.

"For this reason, the practice of returning those who flee Haiti by boat will continue for the time being after I become President. Those who do leave Haiti for the United States by boat will be stopped and directly returned by the United States Coast Guard.

"To avoid the human tragedy of a boat exodus, I wanted to convey this message directly to the Haitian people: Leaving by boat is not the route to freedom."

Well, as you can imagine, this dramatic change did not go without notice. January 17, 1993, the Chicago Tribune columnist Stephen Chapman wrote: "The President-elect has a terrible time making up his mind and keeping it made up. A lot of Haitians are disappointed to find he's something less than a man of his word. They're not the only ones."

So just from these historical moments, we can understand that border security is not a new debate; it is not an easy debate. President Carter, President Clinton, President Obama,

all learned the same lesson. It is, in fact, inhumane to encourage anyone to attempt a treacherous journey in order to reach America's borders without the proper authorization to enter.

There are things we must prioritize to move forward. First, having the understanding that enforcing our laws is, in fact, a humanitarian response.

The next step would be security along the southern border. To put it plain and simple: We can finish the wall, which includes having not just the wall, but additional technologies to solve the problem.

In order to solve problems within our broken immigration system, the bleeding needs to stop. You can't put a Band-Aid on an arterial wound. You need to stop the bleeding. Congress first needs to address the humanitarian crisis at our southern border.

So it was encouraging to hear Secretary Mayorkas announce a reconsideration of filling the gaps in the construction on the southern border wall. I recently took a trip down to McAllen. Between McAllen and Laredo, you can see areas where the wall was being built. The construction had stopped. The construction equipment was literally abandoned at the side, but I was grateful that Secretary Mayorkas did say that he was reconsidering filling in the gaps in the construction in the southern border wall. The problem is the smugglers know where those gaps are. They know how to use them to their advantage.

Again, let me say, when it comes to immigration, America is the most generous country in the world. But is it okay for us to allow over 100,000 people a month to enter our country without authorization? Is it all right for us to subject innocent children to a dangerous journey?

Sovereign countries must define and defend their borders. I believe that America is a country worth defending. It is heartbreaking that after achieving operational control of the border after many years, it was abandoned. It was abandoned through a series of executive orders that was signed early in this President's administration. And what has happened in its place, operational control of the border is no longer determined by the United States of America. Operational control of the border is now determined and dictated by cartels.

This week, we are considering two immigration bills: the NO BAN Act and the Access to Counsel Act. The first will prevent the President from banning anyone from entering the United States. The second essentially provides a lawyer to anyone entering our country unlawfully, thus prolonging the wait times for those who are trying to enter our country through the normal legal process. And that all will be done at the taxpayer's expense.

Clearly, these are the wrong solutions at this time. Our priority should be to ensure that every President has the necessary tools to put forward lawful priorities and not prevent them

from doing so. We should be focused on policies that will encourage legal immigration rather than just reacting to illegal immigration.

It is important that we reinstate the “Remain in Mexico Policy,” also known as the Migrant Protection Protocols. We know this program helped limit fraudulent asylum claims from those who thought they would be able to just walk into the United States, and instead had to wait their turn for a hearing while remaining in Mexico. It is not a good idea to allow lawbreakers to jump in front of those who are here lawfully.

We are still in the middle of a pandemic. Now, thankfully, the Biden administration has kept the Trump administration’s CDC Title 42 authority in place—oh, except for people younger than 17 years of age. We are on the verge of ending the pandemic, but we must ensure that we are doing everything we can to prevent additional spread of this coronavirus. Something that would aid in doing that is requiring a negative coronavirus test before someone is released into this country.

What happened when, under an executive order, the Title 42 restrictions were lifted for those under 17? A lot more people under age 17 started coming through, started coming across. The problem is, each of those individuals will eventually be placed with a family, and by not testing for coronavirus, we are risking placing individuals who are infected with the virus with families throughout the country.

So during consideration of the reconciliation bill, the one that was supposed to crush the coronavirus, I offered a motion to instruct at the Budget Committee and an amendment at the Committee on Rules to provide for COVID testing for all arriving at our southern border. This was rejected in the Budget Committee, and the Committee on Rules would not make it in order to have a floor vote on that amendment.

And once migrants are in our Federal custody, we do have responsibility that they receive appropriate and compassionate care. Under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, we have conducted oversight on the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Since 2014, I have made multiple trips to the border and multiple trips to ORR facilities. In the last few weeks, I visited Office of Refugee Resettlement shelters in Carrizo Springs, in McAllen and the convention center in downtown Dallas. Since my visit to the Carrizo Springs facility, it has been doubled in size. There are so few beds at ORR shelters along the border, there has been a need to expand further, which is why I visited the Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center in Dallas.

It was startling to see those 2,400 cots lined up each to allow a 13- to 17-year-

old boy to sleep at night. They were so close together, any restaurant that tried to open right now with tables placed that close together would be shut down by the public health authorities. And yet, here we were, in fact not just condoning it, we were facilitating it.

Look, the bottom line is, this is not a capacity problem, it is a commitment problem. And we are, unfortunately, on a path to repeat history. Many of us here know the work done by the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health in 2014. That work led to the unaccompanied minors receiving better health screenings, and better healthcare.

When I visited shelters in 2014, the children did not have access to a doctor. They were not receiving any type of health screening. Today, they have access to a full range of medical and mental health resources and children are being screened for communicable diseases, children are being given vaccinations for the usual childhood diseases prior to their release to sponsors in this country. It makes sense to do that. This protects American communities; this protects American schools, where these children will eventually be enrolled.

Today, when a child is released from an ORR facility, they have a phone number to contact the Department of Health and Human Services after they leave their shelter. And they will also receive a wellness check 30 days after their release to a sponsor.

In 2014, it wasn’t that way, children were not given any means of contact after they left Federal custody, and no follow up was conducted. And unfortunately, you know what is going to happen in that situation. Some children will not be placed with a competent caregiver, and they can fall victim to trafficking or abuse.

Now, because of Members of the subcommittee and Members of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce, if children need help once they leave the shelter, they do have a lifeline. These are helpful resources for those who are entrusted to Federal care. My primary goal is to secure the border and to prevent unaccompanied minors from crossing the United States without benefit of citizenship in the first place. But while it is happening, we must do our best to ensure that they are safe after they arrive.

I understand the care of children is a huge balancing act. Once they are in our care, it becomes our responsibility, and we must ensure that those traveling with them are not using them to game our immigration system. It is simply wrong and potentially harmful to the child, not to check that the adult with which they are traveling is, in fact, related or their legal guardian.

Ultimately, we will have to put an end to this crisis. From our experiences, both recent and throughout history, we know that our rhetoric matters. The message must be clear: Do

not cross the border unlawfully. For years, Presidents, Senators, Representatives, have promised to end “catch-and-release” and restore order on the southern border.

The human traffickers, the coyotes in Central America, use our words spoken in Washington, D.C. They use our words to prey on the disadvantaged in Central American countries to entice families into putting their children on the top of a freight train to travel through the Mexican desert. And they do that by putting a price on the head of each child. They use our words to subject children to the violence of cartels, or worse, children who may not arrive in the United States after beginning that journey.

□ 2045

When we say, or even suggest, that children could receive amnesty at the border, we put innocent lives at risk. Our words turn these children into literal game pieces. We can be compassionate and we can provide a secure border at the same time. These two concepts are not mutually exclusive.

In 1980, as former Deputy Secretary of State Bushnell recalled, Congress appropriated over \$400 million to assist holding and settling Cuban refugees in the United States.

And reflecting on that time, later, former Deputy Secretary Bushnell said, “I used this appropriation as a key example of why foreign aid through the Caribbean Group was a good investment. It was much better to help our neighbors build a good economic future for themselves at home than to have a flood of desperate refugees, which would cost more money to settle.”

I think, today, it would be wise to consider Secretary Bushnell’s reasoning. Perhaps Congress could heed my recommendation to address how we send foreign aid to countries such as El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico.

Should it be tied to the care that their children receive?

Here is the deal: Why should we reward countries whose children are fleeing for their safety to our country?

Certainly, it is something worth consideration.

It is simply irresponsible and it is inhumane for the American Government to incentivize anyone to subject themselves or their children to that perilous journey on our border. It was a lesson that President Clinton learned. It was a lesson that President Carter learned. It was a lesson that President Obama learned. And I do fear that it is a lesson that President Biden will learn.

We know the solution. We do know what works. Simply put, enforcement of Title 42 protections for all age groups, not accepting those younger than 17. Accept enforcement of Title 42, the CDC requirement that, during a pandemic, we restrict travel across the border.

Reinstitution of the Asylum Cooperative Agreements with Central American countries. At great negotiation

skill, these cooperative agreements were established, but, unfortunately, they have recently been abandoned. They could be reconsidered. They could be reestablished. We are going to have to have agreements with the countries of origin around asylum if we are going to be able to solve the problem.

The Migrant Protection Protocol, "Remain in Mexico," was successful. It did help in the assessment of the Asylum Cooperative Agreements. This could be reinstituted, and it is probably time that it was.

In fact, it is past time to end a broken and inhumane pattern. It is past time to stop demonizing those who we ask to enforce our laws. It is past time to understand that nonenforcement of our laws does lead to inhumane actions.

It is up to Congress. We are the legislative branch. We are the ones under the Constitution who are responsible for providing this security at our border. What is so critically important is that we must do it sooner rather than later.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker, on Friday, April 16, 2021, announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 164.—An Act to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 415.—An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the scope of new chemical exclusivity.

S. 578.—An Act to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 2021, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1392, the Protection of Saudi Dissidents Act of 2021, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YAR-

MUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2630, the Extending Temporary Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-839. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting results of the financial statement audits of the Department of Defense, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 240a(b); Public Law 115-91, Sec. 1002(b)(1); (131 Stat. 1538); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-840. A letter from the Senior Legislative Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Consumer Response Annual Report for 2020, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5493(b)(3)(C); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1013(b)(3)(C); (124 Stat. 1969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-841. A letter from the Senior Legislative Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's 2020 Annual Report of the Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5452(e); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 342(e); (124 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-842. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress for FY 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-843. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Columbia, Missouri) [MB Docket No.: 20-428](RM-11870) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-844. A letter from the Associate Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Facilitating Shared Use in the 3100-3550 MHz Band [WT Docket No. 19-348] received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-845. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-846. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-847. A letter from the Director, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-848. A letter from the Senior Legislative Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-849. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-850. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-851. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-852. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Federal Acquisition Circular 2021-05; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2021-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received March 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-853. A letter from the Director, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-854. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's 2020 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-855. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting recommendations adopted by the Assembly of the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 73rd Plenary Session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-856. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Office of General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inmate Discipline Program: New Prohibited Act Code for Pressuring Inmates for Legal Documents [Docket No.: BOP-1172-F] (RIN: 1120-AB72) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-857. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31349;

Amdt. No.: 3938] received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-858. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31348; Amdt. No.: 3937] received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-859. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1168; Project Identifier AD-2020-01568-E; Amendment 39-21379; AD 2021-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-860. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1172; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01661-T; Amendment 39-21388; AD 2021-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-861. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment Class E Airspace; Elkhart, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0887; Airspace Docket No.: 20-ACE-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-862. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Prairie Du Chien, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0872; Airspace Docket No.: 20-AGL-33] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-863. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Fort Riley and Manhattan, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0759; Airspace Docket No.: 20-ACE-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-864. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Muskegon, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0871; Airspace Docket No.: 20-AGL-32] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-865. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0910; Project Identifier 2018-

CE-044-AD; Amendment 39-21378; AD 2021-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-866. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1046; Product Identifier 2018-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-21371; AD 2020-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-867. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31354; Amdt. No.: 557] received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BACON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BARR, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARL, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. MACE, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MELJER, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. RESCIENTHALER):

H.R. 2639. A bill to establish forest conservation practices through management, reforestation, and utilization which lead to the sequestration of greenhouse gases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of

1959 to require the authorization of members of a labor organization before such organization may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 2641. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Ms. BUSH):

H.R. 2642. A bill to establish the Cahokia Mounds Mississippian Culture National Historical Park in Collinsville, Illinois, Monroe, Madison, and St. Clair Counties, Illinois, and St. Louis City County, Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2643. A bill to require the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to further develop, finalize, and implement updated regulations for offshore oil and gas pipelines to address long-standing limitations regarding its ability to ensure active pipeline integrity and address safety and environmental risks associated with decommissioning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BUSH (for herself, Ms. OCASIO-

CORTEZ, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2644. A bill to provide direct funding to local, Tribal, and territorial governments to establish Green New Deal programs and initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Financial Services, Education and Labor, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2645. A bill to address the needs of workers in industries likely to be impacted by rapidly evolving technologies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr.

CURTIS, Mr. BERA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2646. A bill to amend the Taiwan Allies International Protection and Enhancement Initiative (TAIPEI) Act of 2019 to provide that the United States, as a member of any international organizations, should oppose any attempts by the People's Republic of China to resolve Taiwan's status by distorting the decisions, language, policies, or procedures of the organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2647. A bill to provide penalties for countries that systematically and unreasonably refuse or delay repatriation of certain nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide self-harm and suicide prevention services in primary care offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2649. A bill to decriminalize cannabis, to establish an Equitable Licensing Grant Program in the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 2650. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the portability of professional licenses of members of the uniformed services and their spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2651. A bill to provide for the retrocession of the District of Columbia to Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 2652. A bill to ensure that certain entrepreneurial development services of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2653. A bill to rescue domestic medical manufacturing activity by providing incentives in economically distressed areas of the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BACON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2654. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage for all physicians' services furnished by doctors of chiropractic within the scope of their license, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2655. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications

by those who possess material, nonpublic information; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 2656. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of Green Bonds and to establish the United States Green Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2657. A bill to prohibit Federal funds from being used to develop, implement, support, or endorse vaccine passports; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 2658. A bill to clarify that aliens who are not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States may not be vaccinated until nationals of the United States and aliens who are lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States are fully vaccinated for COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 2659. A bill to establish a grant program at the Department of Homeland Security to promote cooperative research and development between the United States and Israel on cybersecurity; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CARL, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MACE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2661. A bill to prioritize educating and training for existing and new environmental health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. LIEU):

H.R. 2662. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2663. A bill to prohibit law enforcement officers from using chemical weapons on minors in the course of policing activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 2664. A bill to provide economic empowerment opportunities in the United States through the modernization of public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 2665. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a program to make grants to States for the deployment of broadband service in underserved areas by small business broadband providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 2666. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit providers of broadband internet access service from increasing rates or enforcing data caps or allowances during an emergency or major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 2667. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit providers of broadband internet access service from charging consumers above certain amounts for certain equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of GLSEN's 2021 Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ+) name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H. Res. 327. A resolution in the Matter of Representative Maxine Waters; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H. Res. 328. A resolution to Remove Maxine Waters from the Committee on Financial Services for Inciting Violence Against the United States; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mrs. HINSON, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H. Res. 329. A resolution expressing support for the designation of April 18, 2022, as "National Amateur Radio Operators Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 2642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 2643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BUSH:

H.R. 2644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 2646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 2650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, US Constitution:

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession

of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 2652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 power to regulate commerce

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 2653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]—And To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 2654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 2655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 2656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 2658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 2661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this

Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 2663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 2664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 2665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 2666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 2667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 301: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 322: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 350: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 396: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 402: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MELJER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 413: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 426: Mr. ROSENDALE.

H.R. 472: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 571: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SIREs, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 695: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 704: Mr. ISSA and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 763: Mr. POCAN and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 793: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 826: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 855: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 858: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 958: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 959: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1014: Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 1016: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 1019: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1022: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1043: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1145: Mr. KELLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1158: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1177: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1193: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1258: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 1277: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1297: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1304: Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. CURTIS, and Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1332: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MANN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MANNING, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. MACE, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 1346: Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 1378: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1384: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1477: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1488: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1491: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 1493: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 1496: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 1525: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1553: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1587: Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 1650: Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 1684: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1693: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1704: Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 1730: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1745: Mr. PALMER, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. COMER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1769: Mr. UPTON and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1783: Ms. BROWNLEY and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1808: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1842: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1864: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1946: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRENDAN

F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HERN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1954: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1956: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1996: Mr. COMER, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. MRVAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 2005: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 2021: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 2049: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2079: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2083: Mr. COLE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FULCHER, and Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 2085: Mr. POSEY and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2096: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2102: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 2124: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2125: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2144: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2168: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2188: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 2198: Mr. TONKO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2237: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2244: Mr. KELLER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. COMER, Ms. MACE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LONG, Mr. CARL, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2294: Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 2295: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2339: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 2349: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 2430: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 2486: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 2488: Mr. BRADY and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2497: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2525: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2530: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 2576: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 2606: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2607: Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 2616: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2617: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2630: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 2638: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Res. 30: Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 114: Mr. CUELLAR.

H. Res. 118: Mr. STEWART, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Mr. JACKSON.

H. Res. 124: Mr. TAYLOR.

H. Res. 130: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H. Res. 309: Mrs. HINSON.

H. Res. 314: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H. Res. 317: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. BERA.